



# **FUNDING GUIDELINES PEER PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS**

**UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND**

**MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY**

**ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND**

January 2003



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Background .....	3
Refining Funding Guidelines .....	3
Performance Measures .....	4
Assessing Institution Performance .....	4
Data Availability .....	5
St. Mary's College of Maryland Quality Profile .....	5
<b>Peer Performance Analysis</b>	
Bowie State University .....	13
Coppin State College .....	17
Frostburg State University .....	21
Salisbury University .....	25
Towson University .....	29
University of Baltimore .....	33
University of Maryland, Baltimore .....	37
University of Maryland Baltimore County .....	41
University of Maryland, College Park .....	45
University of Maryland Eastern Shore .....	49
University of Maryland University College .....	53
Morgan State University .....	57
St. Mary's College of Maryland .....	61
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A. Methodology for Selecting Performance Peers .....	67
Appendix B. University System of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators .....	69
Appendix C. Morgan State University Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators .....	77
Appendix D. St. Mary's College of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators .....	81
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 1. University System of Maryland Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines .....	7
Table 2. Morgan State University Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines .....	8
Table 3. St. Mary's College of Maryland Performance Measures for Peer Analysis .....	9



## Executive Summary

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted a peer-based model for the establishment of funding guidelines for the University System of Maryland and Morgan State University. The guidelines are designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept of the funding guidelines is to identify peer institutions that are similar to Maryland institutions on a variety of characteristics. These 'funding peers' are compared to the Maryland institutions to inform resource questions and assess performance.

Included in the funding guidelines process is an annual performance accountability component. Each applicable Maryland institution selects 10 "performance peers" from their list of "funding peers." The Commission, in consultation with representatives from the University System of Maryland, Morgan State University, the Department of Budget and Management and the Department of Legislative Services, identified a set of comprehensive, outcome-oriented performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their performance peers. There are 15 measures for USM institutions and 14 for Morgan. These indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative and include indicators for which data are currently available. In some instances, institutions added specific indicators that were more reflective of the institution's role and mission.

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Furthermore, Commission staff assessed the institution's performance within the context of the State's MFR initiative. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators. In instances where an institution's performance is below the performance of its peers, the institution was required to identify actions that it will take to improve performance. An exception was made for an institution that demonstrates progress towards achieving its benchmarks on related indicators established within the MFR initiative.

St. Mary's College of Maryland participates in the performance assessment process despite the fact that it does not participate in the funding guidelines. St. Mary's has selected twelve current peers and six aspirant peers on which to base performance. The 23 performance measures are similar to those chosen for the other four-year public institutions and also reflects St. Mary's role as the State's only public liberal arts college.

This report contains a comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution, Morgan State University and St. Mary's College of Maryland in comparison to their performance peers. The report includes a discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability. In addition, each institution was given an opportunity to respond to the Commission's assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers. Institutional responses and comments are summarized in the analysis section.



## **Background**

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted funding guidelines; a peer-based model designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept of the funding guidelines is to identify peer institutions (i.e. 'funding peers') that are similar to the Maryland institution (i.e. "home" institution) in mission, size, program mix, enrollment composition, and other defining characteristics. These funding peers are then compared and contrasted with the Maryland institution.

One component critical in determining whether the State's higher education institutions are performing at the level of their funding peers is performance accountability. To compare performance, the presidents of each Maryland institution (except the University of Maryland, College Park; University of Maryland, Baltimore; and Morgan State University) selected ten 'performance' peers from their list of 'funding' peers. The presidents based this selection on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives. The University of Maryland, College Park is measured only against its 'aspirational peers' - those institutions that College Park aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. For the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB), 'composite peers' are used to recognize UMB's status as the State's public academic health and law university with six professional schools. UMB's peers include institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as 'specialized' and institutions classified as 'Research I' institutions. Morgan State University's performance peers are the same as its funding peers. Appendix A lists the criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

## **Refining Funding Guidelines**

In fiscal Year 2002, for the first time, the Commission provided a report to the General Assembly on the University System of Maryland's performance relative to their performance peers. The budget committees expressed concern that this report was not comprehensive because the performance indicators did not place enough emphasis on outcome and achievement measures. The committees requested that the Commission address this gap by developing more comprehensive and outcome-oriented accountability indicators.

The Commission, in consultation with the representatives from the University System of Maryland, the Department of Budget and Management, the Department of Legislative Services and Morgan State University, established a workgroup to address the gap in the peer performance component of the funding guidelines. Based on collaborative decisions, the workgroup identified a set of performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their 'performance' peers. In addition, the workgroup developed a method to assess institutional performance.

Fiscal year 2003 represented the third year the funding guidelines influenced the allocation of State resources. As funding guidelines continue to evolve, so too does the assessment of institutional performance. This report contains the second comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution and Morgan State University and the first for St. Mary's College of Maryland in comparison to their performance peers. A discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability follow.

### **Performance Measures**

For the University System of Maryland institutions, there are 15 performance measures (see Table 1). Not all institutions are required to provide data on all of the measures. There are separate sets of indicators for Maryland's comprehensive institutions and for the research universities. Furthermore, institutions have the flexibility to add specific indicators that are more reflective of their role and mission. The indicators include retention and graduation rates and outcome measures such as licensure examination passing rates, the number of faculty awards, and student and employer satisfaction rates. All indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results initiative and reflect statewide policy goals. Appendix B lists the operational definitions for each indicator.

There are 14 performance measures for Morgan State University (see Table 2). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, student and employer satisfaction rates, and the passing rate on the Praxis II examination (an assessment that measures teacher candidate's knowledge of the subjects that they will teach). Appendix C lists the operational definitions for Morgan's indicators.

### **Assessing Institutional Performance**

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Furthermore, Commission staff assessed institutional performance within the context of the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative. In general, institutions were expected to make progress towards achieving their benchmarks established within the MFR initiative. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators. In instances where an institution's performance is below the performance of its peers, the institution is required to identify actions that it will take to improve performance. An exception will be made for an institution that demonstrates progress towards achieving its benchmarks on related indicators established within the MFR initiative.

For this report, each institution was given an opportunity to respond to the Commission's assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers. Institutional responses and comments are summarized in the analysis section of this report.



## **Data Availability**

It should be noted that it was difficult to obtain nationally comparable outcome-based performance measures. To the extent possible, the measures identified for peer comparisons use data that are verifiable and currently available from national data systems such as the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Database Systems (IPEDS), the National Science Foundation, and *U.S. News and World Report*. Although the National Center for Education Statistics is currently in the process of designing methods to gather outcome-based indicators, many of these data are not readily available. For example, peer data are not available for alumni giving, graduate satisfaction, employers' satisfaction, and passing rates on several professional licensure examinations. In cases where data are not available through national data systems, Maryland institutions obtained data either directly from their peer institutions or compared its performance to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification.

It should be noted that for one measure, the pass rate on the Praxis II examination, research suggests that comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable because of major differences in the testing requirements from one state to another. Since each state independently determines the level of performance required for teacher certification, this indicator is useful only for comparing institutional performance to other Maryland institutions.

In addition, there are subtle differences between the operational definitions found in this analysis and the definitions used in the MFR for several performance indicators. For example, in this analysis, the second-year retention rate and the six-year graduation rate measures the proportion of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduate students who either returned to or graduated from the same college or university. In addition, the graduation data used in this analysis are based on the Federal Graduation Rate Survey (GRS), a federal initiative that collects data required by the Student Right-to-Know Act of 1990. In contrast, the MFR captures students who re-enroll or graduate from the same institution as well as those students who transfer to any Maryland public four-year institution. Because of these subtle differences, it was not possible to assess institutional performance on retention and graduation within the context of the MFR initiative.

Despite the overall difficulties in obtaining nationally comparable performance measures, institutions were expected to take appropriate steps to collect data on all performance measures. In the analysis section of this report, institutions were asked to identify actions that they are taking to collect data.

## **St. Mary's College of Maryland Quality Profile**

St. Mary's College of Maryland's general fund appropriation is determined by a statutory formula and not through the funding guideline process. However, the College expressed interest in providing a set of institutions for the purpose of assessing its performance as

the State's only public liberal arts college. Due to its unique characteristic as a public, liberal arts college offering only Baccalaureate degrees, St. Mary's is categorized as a Baccalaureate I institution. Of the approximately 163 institutions in this category, only a small number of institutions are public. Therefore, along with a small group of public institutions with a liberal arts mission, a comparison group for St. Mary's includes private institutions.

St. Mary's peer group includes twelve "current" peers and six "aspirant" peers. The aspirant peers represent those institutions that St. Mary's aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. Of the twelve current peers, four are public. All of the aspirant peers are private institutions.

The college used the following attributes to identify similar institutions: size; minority enrollment; distribution of bachelor's and master's degrees awarded; distribution of degrees awarded by broad discipline area; proportion of part-time students; location; tuition and fees; and revenue and expenditure data. In addition, St. Mary's examined additional factors to select its peers including: the academic attributes of new freshmen; the proportion of graduates pursuing graduate or professional education; the existence of a senior project requirement; and the value of the institution's endowment. Further, the college chose performance measures that mirrored those chosen by the other State public institutions as well as measures that reflect St. Mary's particular role in the State's system of higher education.

There are 23 performance measures for St. Mary's College of Maryland including many descriptive indicators in addition to qualitative ones (see Table 3). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, faculty salaries, student/faculty ratio and library holdings. Appendix D details the operational definitions.

**TABLE 1. UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND  
PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR FUNDING GUIDELINES**

Performance Indicator	BSU	CSC	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
1. Average SAT score of incoming students <sup>1</sup>	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
2. % minority of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
3. % African-American of all undergrads.	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
4. Second year retention rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
5. Six year graduation rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
6. Six year graduation rate: all minorities	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
7. Six year graduation rate: African-Am.	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
8. Pass rate on Praxis II exam	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
9. Passing rate in nursing licensing exam						Law	Med				
10. Passing rates in other licensure exams <sup>2</sup>							Law				
							SW				
11. Average alumni giving rate/average undergrad alumni giving	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
12. Total R&D expenditures <sup>3</sup>							•	•	•	•	
13. Average annual % growth in federal R&D expenditures <sup>3</sup>							•	•	•	•	
14. \$s in total R&D expenditures per FT faculty <sup>3</sup>	•						•	•	•	•	
15. # of faculty awards per 100 faculty						•	•	•	•	•	
16. Institution-specific measures	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

<sup>1</sup> Institutions have the option of using the 25th and 75th percentile of SAT score for entering freshmen.

<sup>2</sup> For some licensing examinations, overall Maryland passing rate may be the appropriate reference rather than the peer institutions

<sup>3</sup> Comparable peer data are not available. Data for USM institutions.

<sup>4</sup> University of North Carolina System's schools will be used for peer comparison

<sup>5</sup> For institutions other than UMB, peer's medical R&D expenditures will be excluded

**TABLE 2. MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR FUNDING GUIDELINES**

Measure <sup>1</sup>	Comparison Group
1. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
2. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time African American undergraduates	National Peers
3. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time minority undergraduates	National Peers
4. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
5. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, African American undergraduates	National Peers
6. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, minority, undergraduates	National Peers
7. Percent increase in doctoral degrees awarded over base year FY1999	National Peers
8. Graduate/professional school going rate	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
9. Satisfaction with advanced studies preparation	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
10. Satisfaction with job preparation	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
11. PRAXIS II pass rate	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
12. Summary measure of employer satisfaction	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
13. Alumni giving	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
14. Percent growth in grants and contracts expenditures	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions

<sup>1</sup> For all measures, the most recent data available was used.

**TABLE 3. ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND  
PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR PEER ANALYSIS**

Measure <sup>1</sup>
1. Amount in total R&D spending
2. Percent of faculty with terminal degrees
3. Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank
4. Percentile of full-time instructional faculty by rank
5. Average SAT scores of entering freshmen
6. 25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen
7. Acceptance Rate
8. Yield Ratio
9. Second year retention rate
10. Average six-year graduation rate
11. Six-year graduation rate for African-American students
12. Total headcount enrollment
13. Percent Minorities of total headcount enrollment
14. Percent full-time undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
15. Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
16. Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduates
17. Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal grants
18. E&G expenditures per full-time equivalent student
19. Average alumni giving rate
20. Tuition and fees revenues a percent of E&G expenditures
21. Ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time faculty
22. Academic library holdings
23. Academic library expenditures per full-time equivalent student

<sup>1</sup> For all measures, the most recent data available was used.



## **Peer Performance Analysis**





## **Bowie State University**

Bowie State University exceeds the performance of its peers on several performance measures. The university's six-year graduation rates are higher than any of its peer institutions. Furthermore, only one of its peers has a higher second-year retention rate than Bowie. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution exceeds the peers' average. These student populations also have higher six-year graduation rates than its peers.

Bowie selected four institution-specific indicators: the percent of faculty with terminal degrees; acceptance rate; yield rate (enrollment rate); and research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty. The university's level of expenditures for research and development per full-time faculty fell slightly from the previous year, but still significantly exceeds the peers' average and is higher than most of its peers. In this case, however, only four of its peers reported expenditures in this area. Bowie's average acceptance rate is 44 percent; a figure below the peer's average of 79 percent.

The university reports a 100 percent pass rate on the Praxis exam, representing an increase over last year's rate. Additionally, the university's alumni giving rate is slightly higher than average. It increased to 10 percent from 3.3 percent in the previous year.

There are, however, a few cases where the institution performs below the level of its peers. The university's yield rate (or enrollment rate) is the lowest among its peers at 23 percent. This rate has fallen from the previous year's rate of 51.8 percent. Furthermore, the percentage of faculty at Bowie with terminal degrees is 69 percent compared to the average of its peers, 79 percent. According to MFR data, 82 percent of full-time core faculty has terminal degrees. But this number has not improved over the last four years.

In many cases, Commission staff was unable to compare the performance of Bowie relative to its peers due to missing data for a number of measures. For example, data for the alumni-giving category are not available for four of Bowie's peers. Also, only one peer institution reports a Praxis exam pass rate.

### **The Institution's Response**

The institution is developing a new process to collect peer data. It will be a more formalized procedure that includes a letter of introduction for each peer institution and a data template and timeline for implementation. Bowie is hopeful that the new process will result in better data collection.

Bowie also anticipates improvement in the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. It is the intention of the university to hire 30 new faculty members with terminal degrees within the next two years. According to Bowie, the discrepancy between the peer data and the MFR data with regards to terminal degrees was due to the exclusion of full-time contractual faculty in the MFR calculation.



**Bowie State University**  
**Peer Performance Data**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam
Bowie State U.	810-950	90.4%	86.9%	72%	40%	34%	40%	100%
Auburn U., Montgomery	17-23	35.3%	31.9%	57%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
California State U, Bakersfield	840-1090	43.5%	6.3%	79%	33%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cheyney U. of Penn.	N/A	98.7%	97.4%	66%	28%	27%	27%	N/A
Columbus State U.	840-1090	32.4%	26.9%	62%	28%	17%	17%	N/A
Georgia C. & State U.	970-1120	15.2%	13.5%	72%	31%	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Jersey City U.	759-938	56.3%	18.9%	72%	35%	29%	N/A	N/A
Prairie View A & M U.	710-930	95.4%	93.2%	67%	29%	33%	33%	79%
Sul Ross State U.	14-19	58.3%	3.1%	49%	N/A	25%	33%	N/A
Virginia State U.	700-890	96.5%	95.3%	72%	29%	29%	29%	N/A
Western New Mexico U.	N/A	47.8%	1.8%	46%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>803-1010</b>	<b>57.9%</b>	<b>38.8%</b>	<b>64.2%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>79%</b>

**R&D institution-specific indicators**

University	Alumni giving rate	% of faculty with terminal degree	Acceptance rate	Yield rate	R&D expenditures per FT faculty (\$000)
Bowie State U.	10.0%	69%	44%	23%	\$ 21,492
Auburn U., Montgomery	N/A	79%	N/A	N/A	-
California State U, Bakersfield	7.2%	84%	70%	N/A	18,281
Cheyney U. of Penn.	0.9%	62%	82%	26%	-
Columbus State U.	12.1%	70%	67%	N/A	-
Georgia C. & State U.	9.0%	76%	74%	35%	-
New Jersey City U.	N/A	93%	51%	4%	-
Prairie View A & M U.	N/A	73%	97%	57%	110
Sul Ross State U.	11-14%	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,468
Virginia State U.	7.0%	80%	89%	30%	17
Western New Mexico U.	N/A	90%	100%	N/A	-
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>\$ 2,688</b>

N/A - Data not available



## **Coppin State College**

Compared to its peers, Coppin State College has the highest second-year retention rate. While its peers have not progressed in the area, Coppin has improved its retention rate from 71 percent last year to 75 percent this year. Furthermore, Coppin has made strides in the graduation rates of minorities and African-Americans, slightly exceeding the peer average. This increase may be due to several retention initiatives implemented by the college. In addition, the percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is well above the peers' average.

Conversely, the college performs below the average of its peers on a few of its performance measures. Coppin ranks fifth in six-year graduation rate for all students and this rate is below its peers' average. In terms of the college's effectiveness in preparing nursing students, Coppin is below the peers' average in the percentage of students passing the nursing exam. In addition, the college's performance on this indicator has not improved. According to the MFR, the proportion of students passing this exam has declined from 95 percent in 1998 to 83 percent in 2000 and dropping a significant amount to 55 percent in 2001. It has since increased back to 83 percent for 2002.

The college added five institution specific indicators: percent of undergraduates attending part-time; percent of graduate students enrolled; unrestricted, non-auxiliary revenue as a percent of total unrestricted revenue; the average age of full-time undergraduates; and the proportion of commuter students. Although these are primarily descriptive measures, they provide an indication of the type of student population attending the institution. For example, approximately 30 percent of Coppin's student population attends part-time which is slightly higher than its peers' average. Furthermore, the average age for full-time undergraduate students is 25, slightly higher than the peers' average and compared to its peers, the vast majority of the students commute. The percentage of graduate students attending the institution is relatively low. Compared to its peers, the proportion of graduate students is slightly lower than the peers' average.

In a few cases, it is difficult for Commission staff to compare the performance of Coppin relative to its peers due to the number of missing data. For example, Coppin has the highest alumni-giving rate yet data are not available for eight of its peers. For the percentage of students passing the nursing exam, data are not available for three of Coppin's peer institutions and five peer institutions have no nursing program at all. In addition, data are missing from a number of peer institutions on the six-year graduation rate for all minorities and African-American students.

### **The Institution's Response**

The institution notes that its college-wide "Retention Campaign" has been successful in increasing the six-year graduation rates over the last three years. This campaign is a cohort-based, campus wide campaign, which is an intensive effort to contact and provide advisement and problem identification services to students in the 1996, 1997, and 1998

cohorts. These students are routinely monitored throughout the semester and academic year. New strategies to build on this success are being implemented as well. For example, the college is creating retention committees, conducting studies on graduation credit and exit exam policies, conducting a customer satisfaction survey, and striving to reduce the number of undeclared students.

The college is also taking steps to address the 83 percent passing rate in the nursing licensing examination. Continuing upon actions from last year, Coppin has a strategic action plan, which includes specific strategies for correction, dates for accomplishment, preparatory and remedial support for students, guidelines for student selection, and changes in academic hours. Furthermore, Coppin's Division of Nursing now requires a full-time faculty team leader for senior medical-surgical nursing. The college has decreased the number of adjunct faculty and adjusted full-time faculty teaching loads to meet student needs. The college has implemented several other strategies including using computer assisted practice tests to aid preparation for the comprehensive exam and Nursing Student Enrichment Specialists to assist senior students test preparation.

The college has made a number of efforts to acquire peer data. For the alumni-giving rate, the national database used to collect data on alumni giving did not receive reports from many of Coppin's peer institutions. However, in the future, Coppin reports that it will contact individual offices at its peer institutions for these data. In addition, the college worked to collect data directly from its peers regarding the six-year graduation rate for all minorities and African-American students. In many cases, institutions promised to provide data but never followed-up on this promise or Coppin was unable to get anyone to commit to follow-up with their request.

**Coppin State College**  
**Peer Performance Data**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam
Coppin State C.	770-920	96.6%	95.3%	75%	26%	25.5%	25.8%	100%	55%
Alabama State U.	14-18	92.2%	91.7%	61%	21%	29.0%	24.0%	NR	NP
Alcorn State U.	16-19	94.3%	94.1%	72%	42%	N/A	N/A	100%	98%
Chicago State U.	16-19	95.0%	89.6%	65%	24%	N/A	N/A	94%	N/A
Columbus State U.	840-1090	32.4%	26.9%	62%	N/A	17.0%	17.0%	93%	93%
Fort Valley State U.	810-1000	95.3%	94.4%	73%	29%	N/A	N/A	67%	NP
New Jersey City U.	759-938	56.3%	18.9%	72%	35%	34.0%	21.0%	90%	NP
New Mexico Highlands U.	N/A	75.7%	3.0%	59%	23%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	830-1020	46.4%	19.2%	69%	37%	47.0%	40.0%	89%	N/A
Sul Ross State U.	14-19	58.3%	3.1%	49%	21%	10.5%	100.0%	NR	NP
Western New Mexico U.	N/A	47.8%	1.8%	46%	N/A	17.0%	100.0%	NR	NP
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>810-1012</b>	<b>69.4%</b>	<b>44.3%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>25.8%</b>	<b>50.3%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>96%</b>

**CSC institution-specific indicators**

University	Alumni giving rate	Part-time undergrads as % of total undergrad	Graduate students as % of total headcount	Non-auxiliary revenue as % of total revenue	Average age full-time undergraduate	% Commuter students
Coppin State C.	55.5%	30.1%	20.5%	89.3%	25	90%
Alabama State U.	N/A	17.0%	17.5%	85.7%	19	57%
Alcorn State U.	N/A	8.9%	18.3%	89.9%	21	23%
Chicago State U.	N/A	36.2%	26.8%	96.9%	24	100%
Columbus State U.	12.1%	35.8%	14.2%	96.0%	22	94%
Fort Valley State U.	N/A	12.4%	13.6%	88.7%	24	60%
New Jersey City U.	N/A	40.8%	23.3%	95.9%	25	96%
New Mexico Highlands U.	N/A	28.9%	42.4%	95.7%	24	89%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	7.3%	22.9%	10.7%	81.6%	25	72%
Sul Ross State U.	N/A	28.7%	29.9%	95.7%	21	67%
Western New Mexico U.	N/A	41.9%	18.9%	95.7%	20	75%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>92.2%</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>73%</b>

N/A - Data not available

NP - No program

NR - No requirement





## **Frostburg State University**

Frostburg State University's performance on a number of performance indicators meets or exceeds its peers' average. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is well above the peers' average. Despite the fact that Frostburg enrolls student with lower SAT scores than its peers, the university has the third highest six-year graduation rate for all students. Further, Frostburg meets the average of its peers in second year retention rates. The university also compares favorably in its undergraduate alumni-giving rate. Compared to its peers, Frostburg performs at the average of its peers.

The university performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Frostburg ranks below its peers average in the six-year graduation rate for minorities and African-Americans. This represents a decline from last year, when the university exceeded its peers in these indicators. Furthermore, MFR data confirms the downward trend for minority and African-American graduation rates.

Frostburg has two institution-specific indicators: student-faculty ratio and educational and general (E&G) expenditures per degree awarded. The university's student-faculty ratio equals its peers' average. However, Frostburg receives a lower level of resources than its peers. The university has the lowest E&G expenditures per degree awarded and is substantially below its peers' average.

On professional licensure examinations, Frostburg has a high proportion of students passing the Praxis II exam. Many of Frostburg's peer institutions however, use alternative certification tests. Also, the number of Frostburg students passing the social work licensing exam has fallen from the previous year. A further comparison of this indicator is not possible due to lack of peer institution data and historical data.

### **The Institution's Response**

The university has taken several steps to improve minority achievement. First, minority enrollment has increased due to its Minority Undergraduate Student Recruitment Plan. This plan includes additional staff for minority recruitment, 2 + 2 programs, and outreach programs. Second, retention and graduation programs for minorities have intensified. Efforts include establishing a learning community program for first-semester students; providing a wide variety of academic support services; and initiating academic mentoring programs. Frostburg notes that the retention rates for African-Americans and minority students have improved over the last several years. The university contends that this should translate into improved six-year graduation rates over the next several years.

With regards to the need to collect peer data on the social work licensure exam, Frostburg notes that of its current peers, only two institutions offer a comparable undergraduate Social Work (BSW) program. Neither of these institutions track licensing examination results. In some states, eligibility to complete Social Work licensing examinations

requires the Master's in Social Work (MSW); therefore, these BSW programs will not have data on their undergraduate programs. The university however, receives annual reports from the Association of Social Work Boards, which provides the average national pass rate. Below is a comparison of Frostburg's performance on this exam and the national average.

**Passing Rate in Social Work Licensing Exam: FY 1999 to FY 2001**

Pass Rate	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
National	83	79	84
FSU	100	100	89

# Frostburg State University Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam*	Passing rate in BSW social work licensing exam (4)	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate
Frostburg State U.	910-1090	15.6%	11.9%	73%	51%	33.7%	32.1%	91.0%	89%	16%
California U. of Penn.	850-1030	5.6%	4.3%	72%	42%	35.3%	36.0%	84.0%	N/A	12%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	870-1040	8.1%	3.8%	74%	50%	N/A	N/A	91.0%	N/A	21%
Massachusetts U. of Dartmouth	970-1170	9.8%	5.1%	79%	51%	21.2%	21.2%	note 1	N/A	21%
Sonoma State U. (note 5)	910-1130	18.3%	2.2%	78%	45%	35.5%	27.3%	note 2	N/A	2%
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	930-1090	9.6%	3.4%	65%	45%	30.1%	20.7%	note 3	N/A	15%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	960-1140	8.5%	3.1%	79%	56%	39.0%	38.2%	note 3	N/A	16%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	920-1135	8.3%	3.1%	74%	48%	35.2%	33.3%	note 3	N/A	15%
Western Carolina U.	900-1090	9.1%	5.4%	69%	45%	39.6%	43.9%	95.0%	N/A	27%
Western Connecticut State U.	840-1050	15.1%	5.8%	65%	40%	30.2%	23.3%	100.0%	N/A	5%
Winthrop U.	940-1170	26.9%	24.5%	77%	55%	57.1%	60.0%	95.6%	N/A	22%
Average of Peers	909-1105	11.9%	6.1%	73%	48%	35.9%	33.8%	93.1%		16%

University	FSU institution-specific indicators	
	FTEs per full-time faculty	E&G expenditure per degree awarded
Frostburg State U.	22	\$10,276
California U. of Penn.	19	\$12,109
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	N/A	\$11,303
Massachusetts U. of Dartmouth	19	\$15,383
Sonoma State U.	26	\$14,316
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	30	\$11,293
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	23	\$11,322
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	19	\$12,549
Western Carolina U.	21	\$11,846
Western Connecticut State U.	22	\$7,551
Winthrop U.	19	\$9,833
Average of Peers	22	\$11,751
N/A - Data not available		

## Notes:

- (1) Teacher certification test is Mass Teacher Test Passing rate.
  - (2) Teacher certification test is Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)
  - (3) Teacher certification test is Liberal Arts & Science Test & Assessment of Teaching Skills Written (NES). Passing rates:  
SUNY, Oneonta = 97%, SUNY, Plattsburgh = 98%, SUNY, Potsdam = 99%.
  - (4) Passing rates for peers are not available from any of the following sources all of which were contacted:  
peers, state social work organizations, and the national social work organization. This applies to BSW graduates
  - (5) Provided Fall 2005 Cohort for: African-American = 27.3% and All Minority = 35.5%
- \* Comparison of Praxis II scores across institutions is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement, at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.



## Salisbury University

Salisbury University exceeds the performance of its peers on many of its performance indicators. The university attracts highly qualified, new freshmen ranking first among its peers on the SAT exam. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peers' average. In addition, Salisbury performs well compared to its peers in second-year retention and six-year graduation rates. The university has the highest second-year retention rate for all students and the highest six-year graduation rate for minority students. Salisbury ranks second in the six-year graduation rate for all students and for African-American students.

Salisbury selected five institution-specific indicators: acceptance rate; percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctorate, first-professional or other terminal degree; student-faculty ratio; average high school grade point average of first-time freshmen; and state appropriations per full-time equivalent student. Compared to its peers, Salisbury is more selective. The university's acceptance rate is 57 percent compared to its peers' average of 76 percent. Salisbury's focus on enrolling high quality students is also evidenced by the average high school grade point average of incoming freshmen. For the entering class, the average high school GPA is 3.4, which is above the peers' average of 3.19. In addition, Salisbury's student-faculty ratio is below the average of its peers.

In terms of faculty quality, Salisbury performs below the average of its peers on the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. Only 75 percent of Salisbury's faculty has earned a terminal degree compared to its peers' average of 85 percent. Despite efforts to attract more tenure-track faculty, the institution has not improved in this area over last year. In addition, Salisbury receives the third lowest state appropriation per full-time equivalent students; a level that is well below the peers' average.

On professional licensure examinations, Salisbury has a high proportion of students passing the Praxis II exam. Many of Salisbury's peer institutions however use alternative certification tests. On the nursing licensing exam, it was difficult to assess Salisbury's performance due to missing data from its peer institutions. For the nursing exam, four of its peer institutions do not have a nursing program and data are not available for three of the other institutions. It should be noted, however, that that passing rate for Salisbury's nursing students fell from 90 percent for 1999 graduates to 79 percent for 2000 graduates.

### The Institution's Response

The university has taken a number of actions to increase the number of faculty with terminal degrees. In order to keep pace with burgeoning enrollments and the concurrent impact of diminishing its reliance upon contractual faculty, Salisbury added 39 new tenure-track faculty positions over the last three years, all of which require terminal qualifications. It is important to note that the peer measure referenced in this analysis includes *all* full-time faculty, which includes full-time contractual faculty, and which consequently lowers the overall percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. In fact,

although 75 percent of all full-time faculty have terminal degrees, Salisbury reports that 90 percent of its full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty earned terminal degrees.

Salisbury calculates that it would need \$3.7 million in annualized appropriations to eliminate the gap between its percentage of guideline funding and the average percentage of guideline funding of other University System of Maryland institutions. Salisbury notes that since state appropriations remain paramount for any significant progress to occur in attracting and retaining additional highly qualified faculty, state funding to guideline levels is a prerequisite.

The university is concerned by the decrease in its nursing licensure passing rates and is working to correct this decline. It is conducting faculty research to identify predictors of success on the exam that will be used to assess the need for changes in admissions and/or progression standards. The Student Policies Committee of the Department of Nursing will report recommendations to the faculty by December of 2002. Also, the adoption of comprehensive achievement tests and programs are under consideration.

To enhance peer data collection, the university is investigating consortia data exchange agreements and involving various campus departments to assist with the data collection from colleagues at peer institutions. The university notes, however, that some peer institutions remain reticent about data sharing.

**Salisbury University**  
**Peer Performance Data**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr ) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities <sup>2</sup>	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans <sup>2</sup>	Passing rate on Praxis II exam <sup>1</sup>	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam <sup>2</sup>
Salisbury U.	1030-1200	11.1%	7.4%	83%	61%	56%	57%	96%	79%
Central Washington U.	870-1110	12.5%	1.8%	74%	47%	40%	35%	N/A	no program
Eastern Illinois U.	20-24	10.0%	6.9%	81%	65%	44%	45%	97%	no program
Humboldt State U.	940-1170	16.3%	2.7%	75%	41%	N/A	N/A	99%	N/A
Massachusetts, U. of Dartmouth	970-1170	9.8%	5.1%	79%	N/A	N/A	21%	61%	98%
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	1010-1180	7.8%	4.6%	80%	60%	51%	53%	98%	91%
Northern Michigan U.	18-24	4.6%	1.3%	70%	39%	7%	0%	100%	84%
Sonoma State U.	910-1130	18.2%	2.2%	78%	45%	32%	17%	97%	N/A
SUNY, C. at Oswego	940-1130	9.1%	4.0%	88%	60%	50%	61%	94%	no program
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	960-1140	8.3%	3.1%	79%	56%	N/A	N/A	98%	N/A
Western Oregon U.	870-1090	10.0%	1.5%	75%	41%	N/A	N/A	100%	no program
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>934-1140</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>77.1%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>91%</b>

**SU institution-specific indicators**

University	Alumni giving rate	Acceptance rate	% of faculty with terminal degrees	Ratio of FTEs to FTEF	Average HS GPA	Total state appropriation/FTEs
Salisbury U.	18.8%	57%	75%	16.9	3.40	\$ 5,042
Central Washington U.	N/A	85%	81%	20.2	3.20	6,006
Eastern Illinois U.	22.7%	73%	74%	15.7	N/A	7,215
Humboldt State U.	9.0%	73%	100%	17.1	3.20	10,021
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	N/A	73%	87%	15.5	3.00	9,619
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	13.2%	61%	84%	21.3	3.53	6,712
Northern Michigan U.	15.4%	85%	86%	22.6	3.01	8,043
Sonoma State U.	N/A	92%	94%	19.2	3.20	8,088
SUNY, C. at Oswego	16.5%	57%	80%	19.3	3.20	4,883
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	N/A	63%	85%	17.0	3.10	5,935
Western Oregon U.	N/A	93%	83%	15.7	3.30	4,125
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>\$ 6,965</b>

N/A - Data not available

<sup>1</sup>Comparison of Praxis II scores across institutions is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions (in this case, institutions in the states of Michigan and Oregon), Praxis II is a graduation requirement and therefore pass rates will always be 100%, at other institutions (those in the state of Washington) it is not required at all. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II pass rates across institutions may not be valid.

<sup>2</sup>Comparative data for African-American and minority graduation rates, and pass rates on the NCLEX-RN exam are not readily available. The data provided were obtained through an e-mail solicitation of peer institutional research offices, and accuracy is not guaranteed.  
8/27/2002





## **Towson University**

Towson University compares favorably to its peers on the vast majority of its performance indicators. The university ranks first among its peers for the SAT 25<sup>th</sup> percentile and second for the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The percentage of African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peers' average. In addition, Towson performs well compared to its peers in second-year retention and six-year graduation rate. The university has the third highest second year retention and graduation rates among its peers.

The university performs below the average of its peers on the percentage of minorities enrolled as undergraduate students. However, according to the MFR, this percentage has increased slightly over the last few years; from 14.4 percent in 1998 to 15 percent in 2002. Furthermore, a closer analysis of Towson's peer institutions reveals that five of these institutions enroll a high proportion of Hispanic students, somewhat skewing the average. Towson's pass rate for the nursing exam remained at 86 percent. However, most of the university's peers improved in this indicator. Therefore, Towson is now performing below the peer average. However, Towson exceeds the average of its peers in the pass rate for the Praxis exam. The institution reports a 95 percent pass rate, while the peers' average is 93.9 percent.

Towson selected four institution-specific indicators: average high school grade point average of incoming freshmen; percent of undergraduates who live on campus; student-faculty ratio; and acceptance rate. Towson has become increasingly more selective in terms of freshmen quality. The average high school GPA for Towson freshmen is 3.34 compared to a 3.23 average for its peers. This represents an increase from the previous year. Further, Towson's acceptance rate has fallen to 62 percent, slightly below the peer average. In addition, roughly a quarter of Towson's undergraduate students reside on campus and Towson's student-faculty ratio is below the average of its peers.

In some cases, Commission staff was unable to assess Towson's performance relative to its peers because of missing data. For example, data on the average high school grade point average for incoming students are not provided for four of Towson's peers. Also, four of Towson's peers fail to report data on six-year graduation rates for minorities and African-American students.

### **The Institution's Response**

The university stresses that the rates of enrollment, retention, and graduation of minority students are high priorities. It plans to intensify efforts to recruit and enroll minorities and to improve the size and academic profile of applicant pools, admit higher percentages of applicants, improve yield and improve retention and graduation rates. Special emphasis will be on efforts to improve third and fourth year retention of minorities. Furthermore, the university has increased spending on institutional need-based aid and diversity grants. Towson plans to continue this practice in future years.

The university explains that the decline in the nursing licensing exam pass rate is due to a decrease in the number of applicants, necessitating the acceptance of more students with marginal grade point averages. The university is taking steps to reverse the decline in the pass rate. It is designing programmatic changes that will identify vulnerable students early. Furthermore, the university funded an institutional scholarship for nursing students to attract stronger students.

Towson notes that it supplied the Commission with all the data that was available through its source, U.S. News and World Report. Data was missing because peers failed to provide the data to the source. In the future, Towson plans to call peer institutions individually to obtain missing data.

**Towson University  
Peer Performance Data**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam*	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam
Towson U.	1020-1160	15.0%	10.0%	82%	55%	47%	45%	95%	86%
California State U., Fresno	800-1080	45.8%	5.3%	81%	N/A	N/A	N/A	96%	89%
California State U., Northridge	800-1050	48.4%	8.1%	75%	N/A	N/A	N/A	98%	88%
California State U., Sacramento	850-1100	40.0%	6.6%	75%	37%	27%	12%	97%	89%
Eastern Illinois U.	960-1130	11.6%	7.8%	81%	53%	44%	45%	97%	No nursing program
Montclair State C.	900-1110	31.9%	11.1%	83%	58%	N/A	N/A	97%	No nursing program
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	930-1140	24.4%	17.3%	75%	N/A	46%	45%	97%	90%
Southwest Texas State U.	940-1130	26.5%	5.1%	70%	42%	36%	34%	90%	No nursing program
West Chester U. of Pennsylvania	1010-1180	8.4%	5.0%	83%	60%	41%	40%	82%	89%
Western Illinois U.	19-24	10.5%	6.5%	73%	47%	31%	25%	97%	No nursing program
Western Kentucky U.	18-23	9.9%	7.7%	71%	43%	N/A	N/A	88%	86%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>899-1115</b>	<b>25.7%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>76.7%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	<b>88.5%</b>

**TU Institution-specific indicators**

University	Alumni giving rate	Average High School GPA	% Residential Students	Student/Faculty Ratio	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)
Towson U.	12.4%	3.34	25%	15/1	62%
California State U., Fresno	2.7%	3.23	5%	18/1	67%
California State U., Northridge	2.1%	3.06	75%	21/1	78%
California State U., Sacramento	7.7%	3.30	5%	20/1	49%
Eastern Illinois U.	22.7%	N/A	N/A	16/1	73%
Montclair State C.	8.5%	N/A	19%	15/1	23%
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	8.3%	3.49	27%	16/1	71%
Southwest Texas State U.	12.3%	N/A	21%	25/1	64%
West Chester U. of Pennsylvania	10.1%	3.20	34%	17/1	57%
Western Illinois U.	19.8%	N/A	52%	16/1	65%
Western Kentucky U.	14.5%	3.10	32%	19/1	87%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>18/1</b>	<b>63%</b>

N/A - Data not available

\* "Comparisons of pass rates across state lines cannot be made because of major differences in the testing requirements from one state to another." Source: Maryland State Department of Education, MSDE News Release found at [http://www.msde.state.md.us/pressrelease/2001/april/2001\\_0406.html](http://www.msde.state.md.us/pressrelease/2001/april/2001_0406.html). Data obtained from the Title II website at <http://www.title2.org/secReport.htm>.

9/17/2002



## University of Baltimore

Due to the University of Baltimore's mission to provide upper division bachelor's, master's, and professional degrees, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rate and average high school grade point average for incoming freshmen. Instead, it focuses on graduate student achievement and faculty quality. Overall, the university exceeds the performance of its peers on every indicator. The percentage of African-American and minority undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peers' average. In addition, the university is strong in the number of awards per full-time instructional faculty.

The university reports a 74 percent passing rate on the law-licensing exam, an increase over the prior year rate of 67 percent. Unfortunately, peer comparisons for this indicator are impossible, as the university has no peers that have a law school. The university also compares favorably in its undergraduate alumni-giving rate. Compared to its peers, the institution exceeds the average of its peers on this indicator. It should be noted however, that only three of the peer institutions provide data for alumni giving and UB's rate fell from the previous year.

The university selected two institution-specific indicators: expenditures for research and the proportion of part-time faculty. For both of these indicators, the university's performance exceeds its peers' average. UB reports the third highest expenditures for research and ranks third in the percentage of faculty employed part-time. Of particular note, the university's expenditures for research have grown 18 percent over the prior year, much greater than the increase for its peers.

For two indicators, it was difficult to assess UB's performance due to missing data. Although the university has a high alumni-giving rate, data are missing for seven of its peers. In addition, for the number of awards per full-time faculty, data are not provided for three of its peer institutions. Efforts by the university to search for alternative data sources have not yielded new results.

### The Institution's Response

Data for alumni giving for the university's peers is unavailable because the peers either do not keep such data or choose not to release it. The university notes that data collection is further complicated by the peer selection process which limits peers to the same Carnegie classification. The university notes that the peer schools generally have lower emphasis on alumni fund raising. The limitations in the peer selection process also limit comparisons of law licensing exam pass rates. The university agrees to compare its pass rate to the pass rates of other Maryland institutions, noting however, that funding levels may not be comparable, skewing the results.



# University of Baltimore Peer Performance Data

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in LAW licensing exam	Alumni giving rate	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)
Baltimore, U. of	35.7%	30.5%	74%	14.6%	3.77
California State U., Bakersfield	43.5%	6.3%	no law school	7.2%	2.19
California State U., San Marcos	32.1%	3.1%	no law school	12.2%	0.55
Governors State U.	35.3%	29.1%	no law school	N/A	N/A
Houston, U. of, Clear Lake	29.1%	7.6%	no law school	N/A	1.29
Illinois, U. of, Springfield	9.7%	7.4%	no law school	N/A	1.35
Michigan, U. of, Dearborn	15.7%	7.4%	no law school	N/A	1.83
New Jersey City U.	56.3%	18.9%	no law school	N/A	0.41
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C.	11.5%	4.7%	no law school	N/A	N/A
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	43.9%	2.4%	no law school	3.5%	N/A
Wisconsin, U. of, Whitewater	7.2%	3.6%	no law school	N/A	2.41
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>		<b>7.6%</b>	<b>1.4</b>

## UB institution-specific indicators

	Expenditures for research	% part-time faculty
Baltimore, U. of	\$3,268,235	53.5%
California State U., Bakersfield	\$6,251,063	40.0%
California State U., San Marcos	\$1,165,094	51.0%
Governors State U.	\$32,168	53.8%
Houston, U. of, Clear Lake	\$7,491,006	1.7%
Illinois, U. of, Springfield	\$927,963	34.2%
Michigan, U. of, Dearborn	\$2,818,244	42.7%
New Jersey City U.	\$74,300	53.9%
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C.	\$2,145,639	44.8%
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	\$2,463,639	18.9%
Wisconsin, U. of, Whitewater	\$398,842	16.9%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>\$2,376,796</b>	<b>35.8%</b>

N/A - Data not available

Note: Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school had the largest number had the largest number of first-time takers.

7/26/2002





## University of Maryland, Baltimore

The University of Maryland, Baltimore's (UMB) peer institutions reflect the university's status as the State's public academic health and law university with six professional schools. UMB's peers include institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as 'specialized' and institutions classified as 'Research I' institutions. Compared to its peer institutions, the university shows a wide range of performance. The university's unique structure permits only a few generalizations.

The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peers' average.

Using available data, it appears that UMB has increased the percentage of its students that pass licensing exams. Approximately 86 percent of nursing students passed their licensing exam, increasing from 85 percent in the previous year. However, this falls short of the peers' average of 90 percent. Medical students increased their pass rate from 94 percent to 96 percent, meeting the rate of the only reporting peer institution. Similarly, the institution reports that 81 percent of law students passed their exam, up from 79 percent in the previous year. However, peer institutions report an 87 percent pass rate on this particular exam. Also, UMB reports a 100 percent pass rate for the dental licensing exam. Data are unavailable from any of its peers for this indicator. Lack of data also prevents any comparisons of the social work licensing exam pass rates.

The university selected six institution-specific indicators: total medicine R&D expenditures; medicine research grants per basic research faculty; medicine research grants per clinical faculty; percent of minority students enrolled; total headcount enrollment; and percentage of graduate and professional students enrolled. These data show that UMB's school of medicine has the third highest level of research grants per basic research faculty and the third highest level of research grants per clinical faculty. Although the remaining institution-specific indicators are primarily descriptive indicators, they provide an indication of the type of student population attending the institution. Compared to its peers, UMB has the second lowest total headcount enrollment and ranks second in the percentage of graduate and professional student enrollment. In addition, the percent of minorities of total enrollment is below the peers' average.

### The Institution's Response

The university has taken a number of actions to improve peer data collection for medical, social work, and dental licensure examinations. UMB states that these data are not available through national sources. The UMB professional schools individually contacted their respective peers in an effort to obtain this information. However, UMB notes that the social work licensing scores compiled by the Association of Social Work Boards must be purchased and are accompanied by the requirement that scores are for internal use only and not to be used for comparison purposes. In addition, even if the

dental exam pass rates were made available to UMB, comparisons among the peer dental schools are not valid, because all but one uses a different examining agency.

# University of Maryland, Baltimore Peer Performance Data

University	% minority undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in licensure exams			Dental <sup>2</sup>	Social Work	Alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures in medicine (000s)	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per FT med faculty	% growth (5-yr) in federal R&D expenditures in medicine
			Nursing	Medical	Law						
Maryland, U. of Baltimore	34.8%	23.9%	86%	96%	81%	100%		22.5%	\$179,477	\$181,473	10.6%
Alabama, U. of Birmingham	32.8%	28.6%	94%	N/A	no law school			6.2%	\$149,166	\$156,195	11.9%
California, U. of San Francisco	35.5%	1.1%	no baccal. program	96%	no law school			20.8%	\$369,884	\$260,298	-2.7%
Illinois, U. of Chicago	50.0%	9.6%	90%	N/A	no law school		No social work prog.	N/A	\$94,381	\$103,829	14.2%
Michigan, U. of Ann Arbor	24.5%	7.8%	84%	N/A	90%			16.2%	\$183,043	\$116,886	7.5%
North Carolina, U. of Chapel Hill	18.3%	11.2%	93%	N/A	80%			26.4%	\$99,553	\$94,632	7.8%
Connecticut, U. of	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	80%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Texas, U. of Austin	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	93%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Virginia, U. of	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>32.3%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>87%</b>			<b>17.4%</b>	<b>\$179,205</b>	<b>\$146,368</b>	<b>7.7%</b>

## UMB institution-specific indicators

University	Total		Medicine		Medicine		% minorities		Total		Grad & 1st prof. as % of total headcount
	medicine R&D spending (millions)	Basic Res	resrch. grants per faculty <sup>1</sup>	resrch. grants per faculty <sup>1</sup>	clinical faculty	research grants per clinical faculty	of total enrollment	of total enrollment	headcount enrollment	headcount enrollment	
Maryland, U. of Baltimore	\$ 116	\$	155,256	\$	110,036	\$	29.5%	29.5%	5,337	5,337	85.9%
Alabama, U. of Birmingham	128	187,817			110,340		28.4%	28.4%	14,951	14,951	30.9%
California, U. of San Francisco	322	538,738			159,597		45.6%	45.6%	3,517	3,517	97.4%
Illinois, U. of Chicago	56	102,252			43,439		42.3%	42.3%	24,942	24,942	35.3%
Michigan, U. of Ann Arbor	143	145,263			76,989		22.5%	22.5%	40,408	40,408	39.6%
North Carolina, U. of Chapel Hill	110	139,190			48,447		17.1%	17.1%	24,892	24,892	37.3%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>\$ 152</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>222,652</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>87,762</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	<b>21,742</b>	<b>21,742</b>	<b>48.1%</b>

N/A - Data not available

Note: Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school and the largest number of first-time takers.

The following universities are added for comparison with bar passing rates only: Connecticut, Texas, Austin, and Virginia.

<sup>1</sup>UMB figures adjusted to eliminate DMRT faculty incorrectly included as Basic Science faculty.

<sup>2</sup>Scores for peer institutions are not available. However, results for the NERB (North Eastern Regional Board) Dental Examination for the 21 Dental Schools in NERB jurisdiction are available. None are UMB's performance peers. 17 of the 21 Dental Schools, including UMB, had a 100% pass rate for the 2001 graduates availing themselves of all opportunities to pass the NERB Clinical Examination by December 31, 2001. Overall, 99% of examinees across the 21 schools passed the examination. Pass rates at the 4 schools not having 100% pass rates ranged from 96% to 97%.



## **University of Maryland Baltimore County**

The University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) exceeds the performance of its peers on the majority of its indicators. In terms of quality of new freshmen, the University ranks first among its peers for the SAT 25<sup>th</sup> percentile and is tied for first for the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is far above the peers' average. Furthermore, the university's second-year retention rate and six-year graduation rates for minority and African-American students exceeds the peers' average. Comparisons of faculty quality and research are favorable for the university. It ranks first in the total number of awards per full-time instructional faculty and, over the last five years, had the highest average annual percent growth in federally financed research and development expenditures.

The university however, performs below the average of its peers on several of performance measures. For the six-year graduation rate, UMBC is slightly below the average of its peers. The university has taken strides to improve this indicator. As a result, the six-year graduation rate has increased from 50.1 percent in 2000 to 54 percent in 2001. The university ranks last in the total amount of research and development expenditures received from federal, state, industry and other sources. In addition, UMBC ranks last in total research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty. In both instances, the university falls well below the average of its peers on these indicators. However, according to MFR data, the university has increased its R&D expenditures from \$18.2 in FY 1998 to \$29.6 million in FY 2001.

UMBC has the lowest percentage of alumni giving among its peers. The university's 10.1 percent alumni giving rate is substantially lower than its peers' average. It should be noted, however, that this figure exceeds the university's anticipated rate of 9 percent for 2001.

The university selected three institution-specific indicators: rank in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in information technology; rank in the ratio of invention disclosures to million in R&D expenditures; and student-to-faculty ratio. Among the university's institution specific indicators, UMBC ranks first in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in information technology and ranks first in the ratio of invention disclosures to research and development expenditures. Moreover, the university has the second highest student-to-faculty ratio, representing a slight increase over the prior year.

Conversely, the university did not compare favorably in terms of teacher preparation, performing significantly below its peers. However, only two peers report passing rates for the Praxis II exam. It should be noted also that UMBC's performance on this indicator fell to 88 percent from 95 percent the previous year.

### **The Institution's Response**

The university has taken a number of actions to try to understand and improve the graduation rate. A telephone drop-out survey conducted late Spring 2001 revealed that

the primary reason students (who had matriculated as first-time freshmen) leave UMBC within the first two years is because the major they wanted is not available. Compared to the average of UMBC's peers, the campus awards bachelor's degrees in fewer than half the number of majors (27 compared to 67). For example, UMBC is the only campus among its peers that does not offer a business program, one of the most popular majors for undergraduates nationwide. UMBC has proposed and plans to continue to propose, new undergraduate programs in selected mission-related areas to increase the breadth of majors offered.

Nationally, research suggests that living on campus and being involved in campus activities are positively related to retention and graduation rates. In the last three years, the percentage of freshmen living on campus increased from 61 percent to 75 percent. Additional planned initiatives, such as learning-living communities and an enhanced first-year experience program, are designed to enhance student engagement beyond the classroom. The new Campus Commons building, which opened in January 2002, helps facilitate campus efforts to increase student activity and event programs. Obviously, it will take several years for these initiatives to positively impact UMBC's six-year graduation rate.

For the alumni-giving rate, the number of donors and the dollars donated has increased substantially since FY 1998. Alumni donations reached a record high in fiscal year 2001 with over 3,000 donors and over \$330,000 donated. UMBC is a young institution and, until recently, campus efforts in this area have focused more on maximizing funds through corporate and foundation philanthropy rather than through alumni giving. Actions taken to improve performance include: outsourcing the phonathon to reach a greater percentage of alumni, increasing direct mail communication with targeted donor segments and data research to refine alumni contact information.

Of the ten UMBC peers, seven are Land Grant institutions and two are in a university system that is designated as Land Grant. As such, these institutions have greater access to federal funds than UMBC. However, the university made great improvements in total R&D expenditures and R&D expenditures per full-time faculty. From FY 1998 to FY 2001 total R&D expenditures grew from \$18.2 million to \$29.6 million and R&D expenditures per full-time faculty grew from \$53,200 to \$82,100. Additionally, UMBC has begun efforts to improve its grants management infrastructure. Improvements will be made in the tracking and administration of research grants and contracts as part of a new financial system.

The university explained that the Praxis II pass rate fell in the past year because it changed the way in which it calculated pass rate. For FY 2001 graduates, it included test-takers who took and passed the Praxis II test only. For FY 2000, the university included results from graduates who took the NTE exam.

University of Maryland Baltimore County  
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate*	Six-year graduation rate all minorities*	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans*	Passing rate on Praxis II exam**	Alumni giving rate
UMBC	1110-1280	36.8%	16.0%	83%	54%	55%	58%	88%	10.1%
Arkansas, U. of, Main	22-28	12.8%	6.4%	77%	45%	30%	26%	N/A	19.0%
California, U. of, Riverside	940-1190	68.1%	5.6%	86%	64%	74%	54%	100%	8.8%
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	1030-1260	30.7%	2.1%	85%	63%	61%	50%	N/A	49.1%
Clemson U.	1090-1280	10.0%	7.4%	84%	69%	60%	60%	N/A	20.2%
Delaware, U. of	1080-1240	11.2%	6.0%	87%	72%	67%	62%	N/A	11.4%
Mississippi State U.	N/A	21.4%	19.2%	78%	50%	38%	36%	N/A	11.9%
Oklahoma State U., Main	21-26	14.7%	3.3%	83%	53%	39%	36%	N/A	11.8%
Rhode Island, U. of	990-1190	11.8%	3.9%	78%	58%	49%	41%	N/A	13.9%
SUNY, Albany	1020-1210	22.1%	8.7%	84%	62%	61%	58%	99%	38.4%
Wyoming, U. of	20-26	6.5%	0.9%	76%	53%	43%	35%	N/A	20.1%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>1025-1228</b>	<b>20.9%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>20.5%</b>

UMBC institution-specific indicators

University	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to \$million R&D expenditures	Ratio of FTE students/ F-T faculty
UMBC	\$26,044	\$75,272	36.8%	4.95	1st	1st	24.8
Arkansas, U. of, Main	\$70,817	\$103,685	4.1%	1.76	2nd	6th	18.8
California, U. of, Riverside	\$81,056	\$170,286	-3.2%	3.05	8th	N/A	23.9
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	\$56,212	\$139,139	-0.1%	4.70	6th	N/A	27.7
Clemson U.	\$114,016	\$137,534	1.8%	2.03	3rd	7th	17.7
Delaware, U. of	\$74,711	\$82,010	7.6%	2.84	9th	5th	18.5
Mississippi State U.	\$127,377	\$165,210	12.3%	1.32	5th	8th	19.2
Oklahoma State U., Main	\$83,397	\$102,077	6.7%	1.83	4th	2nd	19.9
Rhode Island, U. of	\$47,043	\$75,998	2.6%	1.67	10th	3rd	18.5
SUNY, Albany	\$82,792	\$162,656	30.7%	2.41	6th	N/A	21.3
Wyoming, U. of	\$42,940	\$81,326	1.9%	3.33	10th	4th	18.8
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>\$78,036</b>	<b>\$121,992</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>2.49</b>			<b>20.4</b>

N/A - Data not available

\* 1995 cohort information not available for three institutions: U. of Arkansas, U. of California-Santa Cruz, and SUNY, Albany. Used 1993 cohort information for these

\*\* Comparison of Praxis II scores across institutions is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement; at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.

8/27/2002





## University of Maryland, College Park

The University of Maryland, College Park is measured only against its 'aspirational peers' - those institutions that College Park aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. Therefore, College Park is not yet performing at their level on many indicators. The university is below its peers in the proportion of minority undergraduate students. According to the MFR, College Park's goal is to increase the proportion of minority undergraduate students to 35 percent in 2004. However, this proportion has declined since 1998. It should be noted however, that the percentage of minorities enrolled at College Park is higher than the non-California institutions and the university has the highest percentage of African American undergraduate students enrolled.

Compared to its peers, the university has the lowest retention and graduation rates. The university's 14 percent alumni-giving rate is slightly below its peers' average. In both instances, the university had made significant progress towards meeting its MFR goals. According to MFR data, UMCP is significantly improving the total number of annual alumni donors and is very close to meeting its 2004 goal.

As an indication of the quality of the university's research efforts, College Park performs well compared to its peers in research and development (R&D) expenditures. The total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty exceed its peers' average. In addition, the university ranks first in the annual percent growth of federal R&D expenditures. Although College Park's total R&D expenditures are slightly below the peers' average, this level is higher than R&D expenditures at Chapel Hill, the University of Illinois, and UCLA.

College Park has five institution-specific indicators: the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation; the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation; the percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in one of three national academies; the number of invention disclosures reported per \$100 million in total research and development expenditures; and the number of degrees awarded to African-American students. Although College Park ranks last in both the number of graduate-level programs ranked among the top 25 and among the top 15 in the nation, the university has improved at a much greater rate than its peers.

As further evidence of its aspiration to reach its peers, College Park ranks first in the percentage increase in the number of Maryland faculty members holding membership in one of the national academies. In addition, College Park exceeds its peers' average surpassing UC Berkeley and Michigan in the number of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R&D expenditures. It should be noted however, that three peers fail to report data on this particular indicator.

In preparing teacher candidates, the university reports a pass rate of 89 percent. This represents a drop from 95 percent in the prior year.

## The Institution's Response

The university notes that comparing its performance against 'aspirational peers' which consists of some of the best public universities in the U.S., reflects the eminence College Park is striving to achieve. Although the university is not performing at the level of its peers on all indicators, UMCP is steadily gaining ground on its peers, and on some measures have surpassed them. Of the seventeen indicators, the university leads this eminent group of peers on five measures: percentage of African American of all undergraduates; average percentage growth in federal research and development (R&D) expenditures; percentage change over five years in faculty memberships in national academies; number of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R&D; and number of degrees awarded to African-American students.

In terms of diversity, the university notes that its percentage of minority undergraduates is higher than all but two of their peers. It states that it has the most balanced representation of minorities with African-Americans making up 13 percent of the undergraduate population, Asian Americans making up 14 percent of the population and Hispanic or American Indian making up five percent of the population.

To improve the alumni-giving rate, the university contends that by 2004, rapid growth in the number of annual alumni donors will lead to an increase in the alumni-giving rate and the MFR goal will be achieved. It notes that the alumni-giving rate would equal the peer average if the outlier, University of North Carolina were removed from the calculation.

UMCP does recognize that in key areas, such as retention and graduation, more needs to be done. The university has undertaken a number of initiatives/efforts to improve graduation and retention. These initiatives are aimed primarily at the overall undergraduate population with, in some instance, particular influence on minority undergraduate students populations. Examples include: creating more living/learning programs designed to make the "big campus" small and engage students more fully in the educational process; fully implementing a Web-based degree credit system to improve student advising systems; and developing proposals through the President's Task Force on Student Success to increase graduation rates. College Park believes that the programs outlined above will not only increase the retention and graduation rate of all undergraduates, but also will increase the retention and graduation rate of African American and other minority students in particular.

Currently, two of the university's peers do not require the Praxis exam for licensing. Furthermore, California does not require its teacher training programs to calculate and report its Praxis pass rate. Additionally, California institutions do not report invention disclosure data independently. All such data is reported for the entire system of California universities. The university's Office of Institutional Research and Planning will continue to monitor its peers for use and availability of such data.

University of Maryland, College Park  
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate (5)	Six-year graduation rate (5) all minorities	Six-year graduation rate (5) African-Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (1)	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate		Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty
Maryland, U. of, College Park	1170-1330	32.2%	13.1%	90%	64%	56.5%	89%	14%	\$	252,429	\$ 216,863
California, U. of, Berkeley	1180-1420	54.3%	3.7%	96%	82%	81.2%	N/A	18%		432,504	331,421
California, U. of, Los Angeles	1160-1400	55.7%	3.7%	97%	81%	79.4%	N/A	12%		218,748	139,954
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	1180-1370	25.5%	6.7%	92%	78%	69.7%	N/A	14%		367,464	213,642
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	1200-1370	25.0%	7.8%	95%	83%	77.3%	N/A	13%		368,513	204,275
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	1170-1350	19.2%	11.2%	94%	79%	68.4%	99%	25%		169,519	157,692
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>1180-1370</b>	<b>35.9%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>75.2%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>311,350</b>	<b>\$ 209,397</b>

UMCP institution-specific indicators

University	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	# grad level colleges/pgms/colleges/programs/ specialty areas ranked in top 25	# grad level colleges/pgms/colleges/programs/ specialty areas ranked in top 15	% change over 5 yrs in faculty member- ships in national academies (2)	# of invention disclosures per \$100M in total R&D (3)	Number of degrees awarded to African-American students
Maryland, U. of, College Park	9.1%	4.59	60	45	44%	48	642
California, U. of, Berkeley	6.5%	7.17	121	109	18%	N/A	276
California, U. of, Los Angeles	5.5%	5.30	107	86	17%	N/A	299
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	7.9%	5.53	85	66	1%	N/A	375
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	5.9%	5.82	119	102	22%	30	389
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	3.3%	4.14	72	50	8%	42	328
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>5.59</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>333</b>

(1) Comparison of Praxis II scores across institutions is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement; at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.

(2) Average increase in memberships of 3 academies (AAAS, NAE, and NAS), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies

(3) R&D total INCLUDES expenditures in medical science.

(4) UMCP collects SAT data from the AAU Data Exchange for Fall 2001.

(5) All graduation and retention rates are collected from the AAU Data Exchange and are current as of 2001.

(6) Data for Praxis II pass rates will be made available on August 23, 2002.

Note: Maryland data NOT included in calculation of peer means  
8/30/2002



## **University of Maryland Eastern Shore**

Over the last year, the Commission modified the funding guidelines for the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) to reflect the university's mission and to recognize its status as an 1890 land-grant institution. Therefore, UMES significantly altered the composition of its peers from the previous year. As a result, year-to-year comparisons of peer performance are not provided. However, for 2001, UMES compares favorably to its peers. Despite a lower than average 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile on the SAT, the university's six-year graduation rate for all students and the six-year graduation rates for all minorities and for African-Americans exceed the peers' average. In addition, UMES's second-year retention rate meets the peers' average. It should also be noted that due to the addition of peers that have large minority populations, UMES currently is close to the average of its peers in the percentage of minority and African-American undergraduates attending the institution.

In terms of faculty and research efforts, UMES ranks third among its peers in the average annual percent growth in federally financed research and development expenditures and second in total research and development expenditures per full-time faculty. In both instances, the university is well above the average of its peers on these indicators. The university had made great progress over the previous year in terms of teacher preparation. The university has increased the passing rate on the Praxis II exam to 84 percent from 59 percent. It is very close to the average of its peers on this indicator.

The university added three institution specific indicators: the graduation rate of entering freshmen with SAT score of 900 or below; the graduation rate of entering freshmen with family income of less than \$30,000; and the percent of all students passing all certification examinations. These indicators provide a measure of the university's effectiveness in graduating students from different socio-economic backgrounds. UMES' performance on all three indicators exceeds its peers' average yet data are not provided for a few of the peer institutions. Furthermore, UMES has improved in each of these indicators over the prior year.

The integration of new peers has allowed for better data collection over the previous year. However, there are still holes in the data. For example, seven institutions fail to report an alumni-giving rate. The university's rate exceeds that of those institutions that do report. The university's rate also represents a fairly substantial increase over the prior year.

### **The Institution's Response**

The university noted that it made numerous requests for data from all of its peer institutions. Individual requests for data on alumni-giving and six-year graduation rates went unanswered.



University of Maryland Eastern Shore  
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-American	Passing rate on Praxis II exam	Alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures (000s)
Maryland, U. of Eastern Shore	730-920	80.4%	78.0%	74%	46%	47%	47%	84%	12.7%	\$ 3,895
Alabama A&M U.	17-24	91.4%	90.5%	75%	36%	N/A	36%	N/A	N/A	8,238
Albany State U.	820-980	95.9%	95.3%	79%	39%	N/A	40%	80%	N/A	1,249
Alcorn State U.	16-19	94.3%	94.1%	72%	47%	47%	47%	100%	N/A	7,635
California State U., Bakersfield	840-1090	43.5%	6.3%	79%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.2%	3,638
Fort Valley State U.	810-1000	95.3%	94.4%	73%	40%	40%	40%	85%	N/A	2,768
North Carolina A&T State U.	790-990	93.0%	91.7%	75%	42%	42%	41%	89%	9.0%	13,267
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	830-1020	46.4%	19.2%	69%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3%	-
Prairie View A&M U.	710-930	95.4%	93.2%	67%	29%	29%	29%	82%	N/A	9,128
South Carolina State U.	760-960	97.1%	96.3%	79%	38%	38%	38%	82%	N/A	2,915
Virginia State U.	700-890	96.5%	95.3%	72%	29%	29%	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,422
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>783-983</b>	<b>84.9%</b>	<b>77.6%</b>	<b>74.0%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>\$ 5,326</b>

UMES institution-specific indicators

University	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Graduation rate of entering freshmen with SAT score of 900 or below (19 SAT)	Graduation rate of entering freshmen with family income of \$30,000 or below	% of students passing all certification examinations
Maryland, U. of Eastern Shore	\$ 45,291	21.4%	41%	39%	96%
Alabama A&M U.	39,990	-2.5%	31%	29%	85%
Albany State U.	N/A	2.5%	36%	32%	87%
Alcorn State U.	60,595	33.5%	43%	N/A	90%
California State U., Bakersfield	18,281	20.7%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fort Valley State U.	N/A	-3.5%	37%	36%	91%
North Carolina A&T State U.	43,075	-2.1%	40%	32%	88%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	-	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Prairie View A&M U.	N/A	3.5%	37%	36%	N/A
South Carolina State U.	15,505	-2.9%	36%	36%	90%
Virginia State U.	N/A	7.7%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>\$ 29,574</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>89%</b>





## **University of Maryland University College**

There are very few peer indicators for the University of Maryland University College (UMUC) due to the unique nature of this institution. For example, the majority of students attending UMUC attend part-time which reflects the university's target population: working adults. In addition, the university's indicators reflect other unique characteristics such as the university's goal to serve students through distance education. Therefore, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rate and average high school grade point average for incoming freshmen.

Overall, the university compares favorably to its peers. The percentage of African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is far above the peers' average. The university meets its peers in the proportion of minority undergraduate students.

The university selected five institution-specific indicators: the percentage of African-American graduates in information technology; the percentage of undergraduates students over the age of 25; the number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business; the number of worldwide online courses; and the number of worldwide online enrollments. The university significantly exceeds the performance of its peers on all of these indicators. Unique among these institution-specific indicators is the number of worldwide online courses and enrollments. According to the MFR, enrollments in these areas has increased significantly; over 1,000 percent in five years.

Among several indicators, it is difficult to compare the university's performance relative to its peers due to the number of missing data. For example, as it pertains to alumni giving, peer data are not provided for five of the peer institutions. Although the university has the highest performance on the number of online courses and enrollments, peer data are not provided for most of the peer institutions.

### **The Institution's Response**

The university has taken several steps to improve data collection. National databases were thoroughly searched. Furthermore, institutional websites were searched followed by email and phone calls to institutional research offices of peer institutions. UMUC conducted follow-up calls and sent follow-up emails as necessary.

UMUC is fully committed to getting as much data as it can from the peers. The university believes that as it builds relationships with those peer institutions, it will receive more cooperation from them and be in a position to provide data for more peer institutions than it was able to do this year.

Finally, in the future, UMUC will consider using data from previous years to provide some measure of comparison.



University of Maryland University College  
Peer Performance Data

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Alumni giving rate	UMUC institution-specific indicators				
				# of African- American IT graduates*	% of undergraduates 25 and older**	# of post-baccalaureate degrees in technology & mgmt	Number of worldwide online courses	Number of worldwide online enrollments (registrations)
Maryland, U. of, University College	43.1%	31.2%	5.8%	180	83.8%	248	524	87,423
California State U., Dominguez Hills	71.6%	28.5%	0.1%	2	56.2%	N/A	140	6,720
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	63.3%	20.5%	5.0%	76	47.4%	160	N/A	N/A
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	87.0%	37.3%	N/A	52	62.0%	25	8	150
CUNY Hunter C.	55.5%	19.7%	N/A	3	45.2%	N/A	3	60
CUNY Queens C.	43.2%	10.4%	N/A	7	45.1%	80	N/A	N/A
Eastern Michigan U.	20.4%	15.8%	8.3%	3	30.9%	132	74	3,256
Governors State U.	35.3%	29.1%	N/A	5	70.0%	37	N/A	N/A
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	24.4%	17.3%	8.3%	27	26.5%	82	25	489
Southern Connecticut State U.	19.6%	12.3%	N/A	4	21.5%	0	N/A	N/A
Western Illinois U.	10.5%	6.5%	19.8%	3	16.9%	40	N/A	N/A
Average of Peers	43.1%	19.7%	8.3%	18	42.2%	70	50	2,135

N/A - Data not available

\* Bachelor's degrees

\*\* Proxy for median age of bachelor's recipients, which is not available for peers. (Note: Eastern Michigan U. is the percent of undergraduates 24 and over.)



## Morgan State University

Morgan State University exceeds the performance of its peers on many of its indicators. The university's second-year retention rate for minority and African-American students as well as the six-year graduation rates for minority and African-American students are well above the peers' average. Moreover, the university's alumni giving rate is significantly above the peers' average and the rate has almost doubled from the previous year. The tendency for Morgan graduates to enroll in graduate and professional schools is above its peers' average and well above the statewide average. Furthermore, Morgan has had a substantial increase, over 500 percent, in research grant and contract activity over the last decade. Its peers report an average increase of 222 percent for this indicator

Conversely, the university performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Morgan has a relatively low second-year retention rate for all students compared to its peers' average. Morgan has comprehensive campus-wide policies aimed at strengthening retention and graduation rates. The results, however, are mixed. Retention rates have increased slightly over the previous year for all students. Conversely, graduation rates have dipped slightly. The six-year graduation rate for all students is slightly below the peers' average.

In terms of the institution's effectiveness in preparing teacher candidates, the passage rate on the Praxis II is 86 percent, somewhat below the peer average. However, seven of Morgan's peer institutions either do not administer this exam or fail to report results. Furthermore, the Praxis II examination is not an indicator used in Morgan's MFR. It should be noted however, that Morgan improved its Praxis pass rate from last year, increasing it from 73 percent.

Morgan does not compare favorably in terms of doctoral production. Despite its efforts to expand its doctoral programs, Morgan reports a decrease of 40 percent in doctorates awarded from 1999. This figure is considerably below the peer average and represents a large decline from the previous year. However, because the number of doctoral degrees awarded by Morgan is low, percentage changes are exaggerated. Morgan should consider a more accurate measure of doctoral production, such as the actual number of degrees awarded yearly.

According to Morgan's surveys, student satisfaction with advanced studies and employment preparation has fallen considerably from the previous year. Approximately 49 percent of undergraduate alumni expressed satisfaction with the way in which Morgan has prepared them for advanced degree programs. In addition, 81 percent of undergraduate alumni expressed satisfaction with the way the institution prepared them for employment. However, it should be noted that only one of its peer institutions collects these data. To compensate for these missing data, Morgan compared its performance to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification. Morgan fails to meet the rate of its performance peers or the average of its statewide peers. However, according to the MFR, Morgan's recent performance does not reflect the trend over the last several years.

In many cases, it is difficult to compare the performance of Morgan relative to its peers due to the large number of missing data. For example, data for the alumni-giving category are not available for three of its peers. Among those indicators where Morgan has the highest performance (i.e., second-year retention rates for all minorities and African-Americans) data are missing from at least four institutions. Texas A&M University - Kingsville is the only peer institution that provides data on employer satisfaction. Additionally, only four institutions report any data on the percentage of doctorates.

### **The Institution's Response**

In general, Morgan compares favorably in terms of retention and graduation. Among peers that are public institutions with urban missions, Morgan ranks near the top in graduation rates for African-Americans and above the median in graduating students of all races. Such universities tend to enroll students with pre-college education experience and demographic profiles that resemble Morgan's. Morgan notes, that this is not the case with a number of Morgan's peers. It further notes that these peers enroll fewer African-Americans and have student bodies that are not comparable to those of urban universities in important respects. As such, Morgan trails such campuses when graduation rates for the entire student body are considered.

Morgan acknowledges that measuring doctoral performance by percentage change is not the most appropriate representation of performance. This measure tends to exaggerate the actual change because even a small numerical change on a small base results in a large percentage change. In 2001, Morgan awarded 3 doctorates compared to 5 awards in 1999, a 40 percent decrease. A numerical measure of doctorate production would be a more precise measurement.

The university has been diligent in its efforts to acquire peer data and plans to continue to seek other possible data sources. Morgan notes that it has no authority to ask the peer institutions to collect data for institutional use.

# Morgan State University Peer Performance Data

Institution	Fall 2000 Entrance Freshman Class			Six Year Graduation Rate			Minority	% Inc. Doctorates From 1999	Spring 2001 Graduates		Job Prep.
	Second Year Retention Rate	All	Black	Minority	All	Black			Grad/Prof Going Rate	Advance Studies Prep.	
Morgan State University	74%	74%	74%	75%	39%	39%	39%	-40%	54%	69%	81%
University of Alabama - Huntsville	71%	71%	70%	72%	36%	24%	29%	17%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected
Florida A & M University	88%	88%	88%	92%	43%	44%	44%	0%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected
University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth	79%	79%	81%	76%	45%	31%	36%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected
University of Massachusetts - Lowell	71%	71%	67%	73%	42%	25%	35%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected
Michigan Technological University	76%	76%	64% (21/33)	81% (29/36)	63%	42%	48%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected
Oakland University	74%	74%	Number too small	Number too small	41%	21%	31%	Not Available	Not Available	Not Collected	Not Collected
Jackson State University	74%	74%	74%	11%	30%	30%	30%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected
The College of New Jersey	96%	96%	Not Collected	Not Collected	78%	48%	62%	Not Collected	19%	Not Collected	Not Collected
City University of New York City College	79%	79%	Not Collected	Not Collected	23%	18%	22%	Not Collected	14%	Not Collected	Not Collected
North Carolina A&T University	79%	79%	Not Collected	Not Collected	44%	44%	44%	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
Tennessee State University	76%	76%	Not Collected	Not Collected	38%	40%	40%	64%	31%	96%	87%
Texas A&M University - Kingsville	61%	61%	46%	50%	22%	13%	22%	-50%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected
Average of Peers	77%	77%	71%	62%	42%	32%	37%	8%	21%	96%	87%
Maryland Institutions in Morgan State's Carnegie Classification											
Bowie State University									79%	92%	92%
Frostburg State University									20%	91%	94%
Salisbury University									27%	98%	93%
Towson University									24%	99%	91%
University of Baltimore									34%	98%	84%
University of Maryland University College									Not Available	96%	98%
State's Carnegie Classification Average									37%	96%	92%

Institution	2000-01 PRAXIS		Spring 2000 Employer	Pct. Alumni Giving	% Growth Research Grants/Contracts 1
	Pass Rate	Rate			
Morgan State University	86%	86%	N/A	30%	519%
University of Alabama - Huntsville	Test not used	Test not used	Not Collected	36%	36%
Florida A & M University	90%	90%	Not Collected	30%	216%
University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth	Test not used	Test not used	Not Collected	17%	259%
University of Massachusetts - Lowell	97%	97%	Not Collected	17%	78%
Michigan Technological University	100%	100%	Not Collected	17%	63%
Oakland University	Test not used	Test not used	Not Collected	Not Available	65%
Jackson State University	Not Available	Not Available	Not Collected	9%	272%
The College of New Jersey	Not Available	Not Available	Not Collected	Not Available	1349%
City University of New York City College	Test not used	Test not used	Not Collected	Not Available	-100%
North Carolina A&T University	100%	100%	Not Available	12%	36%
Tennessee State University	Not Available	Not Available	Not Collected	5%	248%
Texas A&M University - Kingsville	67%	67%	100%	20%	136%
Average of Peers	91%	91%	100%	15%	222%

Notes:

\*Footnote 1: Alumni Survey in 1998

\*\*Footnote 2: Alumni Survey in 1999

\*\*\*Footnote 3: Data based on 2000 Graduates: 181/993

1 Base year was FY 1989-90, Current year was FY 1999-00





## **St. Mary's College of Maryland**

As described on pages six and seven, St. Mary's College of Maryland (St. Mary's) has two sets of peers: one set that reflects the college's current mission and capabilities and one set that reflects the aspirations of the college. The college exceeds its current peers in a number of indicators. It surpasses the average of its current peers in second year retention rate, six-year graduation rate for all students, and the six-year graduation rate for African-Americans. St. Mary's spends more funds on research and development and a higher percentage of its professors are full-time. Further, St. Mary's students have higher SAT scores than the students of most of its peers. It also has a higher percentage of minorities in its student population.

St. Mary's accepts a greater percentage of its applicants than the average of its peers, however, its yield rate is also greater. It should also be noted that St. Mary's tuition is markedly lower than the average of its peers, reflecting its public school status. Of the twelve current peers, four are public institutions. In a comparison of St. Mary's data to that of the public institutions only, St. Mary's ranks first in the vast majority of indicators, notably: faculty salaries, percentage of full-time faculty, second year retention and graduation rate for African-American students.

Not surprisingly, St. Mary's does not yet reach the average of its aspirant peers on most of its qualitative indicators. In a few instances, however, St. Mary's does exceed its aspirant peers. St. Mary's has a greater percentage of minorities of all but one of its peers. It also has the lowest tuition and the greatest number of students receiving federal aid. Further, St. Mary's academic library boasts the greatest number of serial subscriptions of its aspirant peers.

St. Mary's fails to meet the averages of both its current and aspirant peers in a few categories. For example, it fails to meet the average of its peers in the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. However, the college does meet its MFR goal: 98 percent of its core full-time faculty has terminal degrees. The institution lags significantly behind its peers in the rate of alumni giving, ranking the third lowest among all 18 peers. Similarly, only three other institutions have lower E&G expenditures per full-time student. And lastly, St. Mary's has a higher than average ratio of full-time students to full-time faculty.

It should be noted that St. Mary's data and the data of its peers were complete.

### **The Institution's Response**

The college explains that its burgeoning enrollment has affected some of its performance measures. For example, the college increased its faculty in response to the increase in the student base. However, many of the new faculty were recruited at the instructor and assistant professor levels. In some cases, the entry-level staff did not have terminal degrees. The college notes, however, that all full-time faculty at the associate and full professors have terminal degrees.

The student enrollment growth of 18 percent in the past two years has outpaced the efforts to increase faculty. Therefore, the college's average ratio of full-time students to full-time faculty is higher than its peers. The college expresses concern over the level of funds required to reduce this ratio.

St. Mary's alumni giving program is fairly new. The college is striving to educate their alumni in the importance of the program. New efforts include: the establishment of a senior class gift program; solicitations with the specific goal of increasing alumni participation; emphasis on affinity program solicitations; encouragement of phonathon participation; and the production of an annual fund brochure. St. Mary's is confident that these programs will substantially increase alumni giving and that they will reach a goal of 30 percent participation by the end of calendar year 2004.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND  
PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, 2001

INDICATOR	CURRENT PEERS															
	Current Peer Average	Adjunct Peer Average	All Peers Average	SMCM	BELOIT	COLL OF WOOLSTER	COLORADO	CONN COLL	DICKINSON	GETTYSBURG	GUILFORD	MWC	SOUTH-WESTERN	U OF MICH MORRIS	U OF NC ASHEVILLE	YMI
QUALITY/SELECTIVITY																
Amount in total R & D spending, FY00	\$ 514,203	\$ 596,598	\$ 541,668	\$ 549,482	\$ 39,458	\$ 139,506	\$ 211,297	\$ 1,255,368	\$ 1,595,429	\$ 586,693	\$ 78,789	\$ 622,733	\$ 732,267	\$ 186,326	\$ 624,555	\$ 98,019
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees	92%	96%	94%	91%	98%	95%	95%	92%	90%	92%	88%	91%	97%	91%	84%	96%
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank:																
Professor	\$ 70,600	\$ 81,217	\$ 74,139	\$ 74,700	\$ 67,000	\$ 65,300	\$ 81,200	\$ 83,000	\$ 72,200	\$ 78,100	\$ 50,100	\$ 68,400	\$ 77,600	\$ 66,700	\$ 67,300	\$ 70,300
Associate Professor	53,083	59,283	55,150	55,400	51,700	51,200	58,000	61,500	55,800	58,100	46,900	53,200	57,500	53,300	51,600	38,200
Assistant Professor	42,733	47,200	44,222	41,900	42,800	41,900	45,400	47,100	43,300	46,500	37,900	41,300	44,800	38,700	40,900	42,200
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank:																
Professor	79.8%	92.4%	84.0%	87.3%	80.0%	76.3%	92.6%	93.8%	85.0%	90.4%	25.7%	81.3%	90.1%	79.4%	80.3%	83.2%
Associate Professor	73.8%	89.6%	79.1%	84.4%	73.9%	72.0%	89.8%	93.0%	85.2%	90.0%	49.8%	79.6%	88.8%	80.0%	73.6%	10.2%
Assistant Professor	68.3%	86.9%	74.5%	66.1%	72.2%	66.1%	83.6%	88.0%	75.5%	86.4%	35.2%	62.1%	82.1%	41.4%	59.2%	68.2%
Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	1201	1306	1206	1220	1220	1170	1245	1297	1220	1200	1133	1225	1235	1190	1150	1125
25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	1104-1298	1217-1395	1141-1330	1130-1310	1120-1320	1060-1280	1170-1320	1216-1377	1130-1310	1130-1270	1000-1270	1130-1320	1140-1330	1070-1310	1040-1260	1040-1210
Acceptance Rate	64%	43%	58%	77%	67%	74%	57%	32%	64%	68%	78%	56%	59%	87%	64%	66%
Yield Ratio	34%	33%	30%	37%	31%	29%	28%	33%	24%	28%	29%	36%	39%	49%	38%	47%
RETENTION AND GRADUATION																
Second year retention rate	85%	94%	88%	86%	91%	84%	92%	92%	89%	87%	77%	84%	87%	80%	78%	84%
Average Six year graduation rate	68%	80%	78%	72%	68%	70%	79%	80%	78%	75%	59%	74%	70%	49%	50%	63%
Six year graduation rate for African-Americans	61%	80%	69%	62%	57%	Not Avail.	91%	59%	83%	Not Avail.	79%	43%	Not Avail.	31%	48%	59%
ACCESS, Fall 2000																
Total headcount enrollment	2,043	1,761	1,949	1,547	1,262	1,837	1,942	1,856	2,115	2,234	1,246	4,282	1,309	1,842	3,292	1,300
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	11.1%	11.0%	11.1%	14.1%	13.1%	7.0%	14.4%	9.4%	5.6%	4.5%	14.9%	10.7%	17.8%	16.0%	6.8%	12.9%
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	93.3%	99.1%	95.2%	90.3%	95.1%	97.9%	99.2%	93.7%	98.7%	98.7%	88.8%	81.6%	98.5%	93.4%	73.9%	100.0%
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	99.2%	100.0%	99.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.8%	97.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.8%	100.0%	100.0%	98.6%	100.0%
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduates	\$15,393	\$24,906	\$18,656	\$7,360	\$21,550	\$21,920	\$22,800	\$31,983	\$24,450	\$24,875	\$16,815	\$3,246	\$15,790	\$3,567	\$1,993	\$10,712
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY00	17.3%	9.3%	14.7%	15.0%	18.0%	14.0%	16.0%	10.0%	12.0%	11.0%	19.0%	9.0%	13.0%	53.0%	16.0%	17.0%
EFFICIENCY/RESOURCES																
E&G expenditures per FTE	\$ 21,838	\$ 26,868	\$ 23,515	\$ 17,404	\$ 20,034	\$ 26,485	\$ 23,883	\$ 34,472	\$ 23,960	\$ 22,976	\$ 25,063	\$ 10,568	\$ 27,544	\$ 12,341	\$ 13,706	\$ 21,026
Average alumni giving rate	34%	49.5%	39%	22%	45%	40%	38%	49%	37%	43%	28%	34%	34%	17%	10%	35%
Tuition and fees revenues as percent of E&G expenditures	45.9%	64.3%	52.0%	36.8%	50.0%	50.1%	60.9%	57.1%	54.9%	71.4%	48.7%	40.5%	37.5%	29.8%	15.2%	34.4%
Ratio of FTEs to full-time faculty	14.1	11.7	13.3	14.3	13.4	12.2	13.4	9.9	12.8	12.6	17.5	18.3	11.9	17.5	15.1	15.1
Academic library holdings																
Titles:	355,510	593,013	439,335	116,267	243,779	448,348	481,050	436,582	305,272	328,503	250,000	354,326	303,017	252,601	252,601	507,133
Serial subscriptions:	15,957	2,726	11,547	7,286	980	5,039	4,010	2,357	6,163	2,331	2,000	1,713	1,425	1,100	2,313	162,053
Audiovisual materials:	23,992	47,913	31,467	15,612	15,612	10,650	40,473	142,303	12,247	20,148	9,660	342	9,820	4,522	8,855	4,896
Academic library expenditures per FTE	\$ 297	\$ 560	\$ 385	\$ 254	\$ 234	\$ 382	\$ 282	\$ 431	\$ 611	\$ 219	\$ 131	\$ 179	\$ 507	\$ 147	\$ 257	\$ 189

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND  
PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, :

	ASPIRANT FEES:					
INDICATOR	HATIE	CARLETON	DAVIDSON	FEAR	HAMILTON	KENYON
<b>QUALITY/SELECTIVITY</b>						
Amount in total R & D spending, FY00	\$ 387,385	\$ 321,119	\$ 432,320	\$ 1,129,000	\$ 1,060,800	\$ 248,961
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees	94%	92%	98%	97%	99%	97%
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank:						
Professor	\$ 83,200	\$ 82,200	\$ 80,100	\$ 85,100	\$ 84,300	\$ 72,400
Associate Professor	61,300	60,900	57,500	59,800	59,600	52,600
Assistant Professor	46,800	50,600	45,800	48,700	48,600	42,700
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank:						
Professor	94.0%	93.3%	91.8%	95.3%	94.7%	85.2%
Associate Professor	92.8%	92.4%	88.8%	91.5%	94.8%	77.3%
Assistant Professor	87.2%	93.1%	84.8%	91.3%	91.3%	71.3%
Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	1,330	1,375	1,330	1,260	1,250	1,290
25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	1250-1410	1280-1470	1240-1420	1170-1350	1160-1340	1200-1380
Acceptance Rate	29%	44%	36%	56%	39%	65%
Yield Ratio	38%	22%	41%	26%	31%	31%
<b>RETENTION AND GRADUATION</b>						
Second year retention rate	93%	94%	98%	95%	92%	91%
Average six year graduation rate	84%	89%	90%	81%	86%	84%
Six-year graduation rate for African-Americans	80%	75%	88%	87%	69%	79%
<b>ACCESS, Fall 2000</b>						
Total headcount enrollment	1,694	1,936	1,679	1,892	1,765	1,599
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	8.2%	15.3%	10.7%	10.2%	12.3%	9.3%
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	100.0%	98.9%	99.9%	98.0%	98.9%	98.6%
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	\$32,650	\$24,390	\$23,094	\$24,866	\$26,100	\$26,080
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY00	10.0%	13.0%	6.0%	7.0%	10.0%	10.0%
<b>EFFICIENCY/RESOURCES</b>						
E&G expenditures per FTE	\$ 27,131	\$ 28,548	\$ 30,644	\$ 25,892	\$ 27,456	\$ 21,335
Average alumni giving rate	52%	61%	53%	37%	53%	41%
Tuition and fees revenues as percent of E&G expenditures	80.2%	55.5%	50.7%	64.7%	62.5%	72.0%
Ratio of FTEs to full-time faculty	11.2	11.4	10.6	12.5	11.2	13.3
Academic library holdings						
Titles:	524,830	629,099	569,981	437,789	538,377	838,000
Serial subscriptions:	2,012	1,555	2,566	2,135	3,585	4,500
Audiovisual materials:		2,037	8,256	11,219	52,051	166,000
Academic library expenditures per FTE	\$ 448	\$ 468	\$ 476	\$ 509	\$ 557	\$ 501

## **Appendices**



## **Appendix A. Methodology for Selecting Performance Peers**

The process of selecting peers involved narrowing a long list of colleges and universities (approximately 3,600) to a medium-sized list (fewer than 250), then to a small group with key characteristics like those of the 'home' institution (between 22 and 60). The institutions in the smaller group are termed funding peers. Ultimately, USM institutions were asked to choose 10 performance peers from their lists.

The narrowing process proceeded as follows:

1. Only public universities were considered.
2. Institutions were categorized by Carnegie classification.
3. Six sets of variables were mathematically analyzed for each institution. Examples of these variables include:
  - Size
  - Student mix
  - Non-state revenues
  - Program mix
  - Location (urban vs. rural)

The analysis aimed to provide a comparatively short list of institutions, which are most like each USM institution. From the narrowed list, each USM institution then selected 10 performance peers based on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives.

Below is a list of top criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

### **Bowie**

- SATs and/or ACT profiles
- Academic mission
- Types of programs
- General academic reputation
- Comparable student communities served

### **Coppin**

- Program mix, especially teacher preparation
- Size
- Geographic location

### **Frostburg**

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Size
- Program mix
- Geographic location

#### **Salisbury**

- Size
- Program mix
- Mission

#### **Towson**

- Size
- Student mix
- Geographic location

#### **University of Baltimore**

- Program mix
- Size
- Urban setting

#### **University of Maryland Baltimore County**

- Size
- Mission, emphasis on science and technology
- Minority mix
- Exclusion of institutions with medical schools

#### **University of Maryland Eastern Shore**

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Program mix
- Minority mix

#### **University of Maryland University College**

- Percentage of students over the age of 25
- Institution ranking
- Type of delivery formats used – especially on-line distance education program



## Appendix B: University System of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1 SAT score 25 <sup>th</sup> /75 <sup>th</sup> %ile	NCES, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Fall 2001; AAU Data Exchange (for UMCP)	For all incoming freshmen, composite SAT score. For peer institutions which report ACT scores, ACT scores are reported but not converted to SAT. If institutions report both scores, the test which the greater number of students took is reported.	Fall 2001
2 % minorities of all undergraduates	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey IPEDS Peer Analysis Website – Fall Enrollment (for SU)	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	Fall 2000  Fall 2001 (for SU)
3 % African-American of all undergraduates	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey IPEDS Peer Analysis Website – Fall Enrollment (for SU)	Self-explanatory	Fall 2000  Fall 2001 (for SU)
4 Average second-year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition; AAU Data Exchange (for UMCP)	The percentage of first-year freshmen who returned to the same college or university the following fall, averaged over the first-year classes entering between 1996 and 1999 (1997 and 2000 for UMCP).	1996-1999 data 1997-2000 data for UMCP
5 Six-year graduation rate	College Board, Annual Survey of Colleges, 2001-2002; IPEDS GRS – obtained from peers (for UMBC); AAU Data Exchange (for UMCP)	Six-year graduation rate, 1994 cohort (1995 cohort for UMBC)	2000 (1994 cohort) 2001 (1995 cohort) – for UMBC and UMCP
6 Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey, obtained from peers; AAU Data Exchange (for UMCP)	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	2000 (1994 cohort) 2001 (1995 cohort) – for UMBC & UMCP
7 Six-year graduation rate: African-Americans	IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey, obtained from peers; AAU Data	Self-explanatory.	2000 (1994 cohort) or 2001 (1995

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
	Exchange (for UMCP)		cohort)
8 Passing rate on Praxis II exam	Peer institutions	Number of undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students who passed Praxis II (or NTE if applicable) divided by the number of undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students who took Praxis II.	2000 graduates 2001 graduates for UMBC
9 Passing rate in nursing licensing exam	Peer institutions	Number of BSN graduates in the Class of 2000 who pass the NCLEX examination on the first attempt divided by the number of graduates who took the exam.	2000 graduates
10 Passing rates in other licensure exams 10a Law – Bar examination	ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2003 edition	Percentage of 2000 graduates who took the bar examination for the first time in Summer 2000 and February 2001 and passed on first attempt. Pass rates are reported only for the jurisdiction in which the school had the largest number of first-time takers.	2000 graduates
10b Pharmacy – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	Number of pharmacy graduates in the Class of 2001 who passed the NAPLEX on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2001 graduates
10c Social Work – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	For UMB: number of MSW graduates who passed the Licensed Graduate Social Work Exam in 2000 divided by number who took the exam. For FSU: number of BSW graduates in the Class of 2001 who passed the LCSW examination on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2000  2001 graduates
10d Dentistry – Examination	Peer institutions	Number of DDS graduates in the Class of 2001 who pass their respective regional dental examination by December 31, 2001 divided by number of graduates from Dental School Class of 2001.	2001 graduates
10e Medical – Examination	Peer institutions	Number who pass the 2001 USMLE Step II on first attempt divided by number of examinees from the School of Medicine.	Class of 2001
11 Alumni giving rate  <u>OR</u>  Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	Council for Aid to Education, 2001 Voluntary Support of Education U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Alumni donors as a percentage of alumni solicited (Definition and source used by all institutions except UMCP & FSU and their peers)  Average percent of undergraduate alumni of record who donated money to the institution. Alumni of record are former full- or part-time students with an undergraduate degree for whom the institution has a current address. Undergraduate alumni donors made	2001   1999-2000

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
		one or more gifts for either current operations or capital expenses during the specified academic year. The alumni giving rate is the number of appropriate donors during a given year divided by the number of appropriate alumni of record. The rates were averaged for 1999 and 2000. (Definition and source used by UMCP & FSU and their peers.)	
12 Total R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB. UMB figures include R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> .	FY 2000
13 Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation (R&D \$); AAUP, Faculty Salary Survey (faculty counts); NCES, Employees by Assigned Position, 2001 (medical faculty).	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per full-time instructional faculty member at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB. UMB figures are R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> . Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from most recent AAUP counts for institutions other than UMB. For UMB and peers, faculty are full-time medical faculty whose assignments are for instruction or research. For UMB, faculty counts are taken from NCES, Employees by Assigned Position, 2001.	FY 2000
14 Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation	Average annual growth rate in federally financed R&D expenditures over the 5-year period from FY95 through FY 2000. Excludes federally financed expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB. UMB figures include federally financed R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> .	FY95 - FY 2000
15 Number of faculty awards per 100 faculty (5 yrs.)	USM data base (built from national publications and databases)	The total number of awards per 100 full-time instructional faculty at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor over the 5-year period from 1998 through 2002. Awards counted: Fulbrights, Guggenheims, NEH fellowships, CAREER (Young Investigator) awards, Sloan fellowships. Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from most recent AAUP counts.	1998 - 2002

## 16 Institution-specific peer performance measures

### Bowie

1	% faculty with terminal degrees	College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, 2001-2002	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	Fall 2000
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2000
3	Yield rate	College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, 2001-2002	Percentage of freshman applicants who enrolled	Fall 2000
4	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation and AAUP	Average dollars spent on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per core faculty (full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty)	FY 2000

### Coppin

1	% part-time undergraduates of total undergraduate enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2000	Self-explanatory	Fall 2000
2	% graduate students of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2000	Self-explanatory	Fall 2000
3	Unrestricted non-auxiliary funds as % of total funds	IPEDS, Finance Survey, FY 2000	Total unrestricted current funds revenues minus unrestricted revenues from auxiliary enterprises divided by total unrestricted current funds revenues	FY 2000
4	Average age full-time undergraduate	Embark <a href="http://www.embark.com">www.embark.com</a>	Self-explanatory	2000-2001
5	% commuter students	Peterson's <a href="http://www.Petersons.com">www.Petersons.com</a>	Percent of students who do not live in college owned housing or dorm	2000-2001

<b>Frostburg</b>				
1	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2000 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall 2000
2	E&G expenditure per degree awarded	IPEDS, GRS and Finance Survey	E&G expenditure/number of graduates	FY 2001
<b>Salisbury</b>				
1	Acceptance rate	U.S. News & World Rpt, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	The ratio of admitted first-time, first-year, degree-seeking students to total applicants. Total applicants include students who meet all requirements to be considered for admission AND who were notified of an admission decision.	Fall 2000
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	College Board, Annual Survey of Colleges, 2001-2002	The percentage of full-time faculty (both tenured/tenure-track and contractual) who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree.	Fall 2000
3	Ratio of FTES to FTEF	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – Fall Enrollment and Fall Staff	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent faculty. Both numbers are calculated values: FT headcount + 1/3 PT headcount. FTES is derived from the Fall Enrollment Survey, and FTEF is derived from the Fall Staff Survey.	Fall 2001
4	Average high school GPA	U.S. News & World Rpt, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year freshman students who submitted GPA.	Fall 2000
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2001 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2000	Unrestricted state appropriation divided by FTES. Unrestricted state appropriation is from the Finance Survey, and FTES is derived from the Fall Enrollment Survey. FTES is calculated as FT headcount + 1/3 PT headcount.	FY 2001 state appropriation, Fall 2000 enrollment
<b>Towson</b>				
1	Average high school GPA	U.S. News & World Report	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted GPA	Fall 2000
2	% undergraduates who live on campus (Residential Students)	U.S. News & World Report	Percentage of all degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 1999 who live in college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing	Fall 2000

3	Student-to-faculty ratio	U.S. News & World Report	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent instructional faculty. Undergraduate or graduate student teaching assistants are not counted as faculty.	Fall 2000
4	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)	U.S. News & World Report	The number of freshmen applicants divided by the number of freshmen admitted	Fall 2000
<b>UB</b>				
1	Expenditures for research	IPEDS, Finance Form, Part B, line 2	Total dollars expended for research	FY 2000
2	% part-time of all faculty	IPEDS, Fall Staff, lines 22 and 77	Percentage of faculty who are not employed full-time	Fall 2000
<b>UMB</b>				
1	Total medicine research & development spending	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2001
2	Medicine research grants per basic research faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2001
3	Medicine research grants per clinical faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2001
4	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	Fall 2000
5	Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	All students: undergraduate, graduate, and first professional	
6	Percent graduate & first professional as percent of total headcount	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	
<b>UMBC</b>				
1	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	IPEDS completions	Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. FY 2001 Completions. Information technology degrees include the following: Computer & Information Sciences; Computer Programming; Data Processing Tech; Information Sciences & Systems; Computer Systems Analysis; Computer Science; Computer Engineering; Electrical, Electronics &	FY 2001



Communication.

FY 2000

Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to \$million R&D expenditures

AUTM, National Science Foundation

Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. Number of invention disclosures, no matter how comprehensive, counted by institution (AUTM) divided by \$million in R&D expenditures (NSF) from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources

Ratio of FTE students/ FT faculty

IPEDS Enrollment Files, AAUP

Ratio of FTE students to FT faculty (per AAUP based on categories of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor) for 2000.

Fall 2000

UMCP

1 # of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation  
National Research Council, U.S. News, The Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Business Week, Success  
Total number of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation by one or more of five specified publications in their most recent rankings of that particular college/program/specialty area. Rankings are unduplicated, meaning that not more than one top 25 ranking can be claimed per discipline or specialty area, and the discipline/program data must be comparable across all peer institutions.  
Most recent rankings published for a particular college, program, or specialty area

2 # of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation

National Research Council, U.S. News, The Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Business Week, Success

Total number of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation in one or more of five specified publications in their most recent rankings of that particular college/program/specialty area. Rankings are unduplicated, meaning that not more than one top 15 ranking can be claimed per discipline or specialty area, and the discipline/program data must be comparable across all peer institutions.  
Most recent rankings published for a particular college, program, or specialty area

3 % change over five years in faculty memberships in national academies

USM database

The percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in one of three national academies (American Academy of Arts and Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and National Academy of Sciences), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies.  
1998-2002

4 Number of invention disclosures per \$100M in R&D

Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), National Science

The number of invention disclosures reported by the institution to AUTM, per each \$100 million in TOTAL research and development (R&D) expenditures reported for the institution by NSF.  
Fall 2000

Foundation (NSF)				Academic year 2001
5	Number of degrees awarded to African-American Students	IPEDS Completions survey via AAUDE	The number of undergraduate degrees awarded to African-American students	
<b>UMES</b>				
1	Graduation rates of educationally disadvantaged students	Peer institutions	Percent of full-time, degree-seeking entering freshmen with SAT scores of 900 or less who graduate within 6 years	Fall 2000 (1994 entering freshmen cohort)
2	Graduation rates of economically disadvantaged students	Peer institutions	Percent of full-time, degree-seeking entering freshmen with family incomes of \$30,000 or less who graduate within 6 years	Fall 2000 (1994 entering freshmen cohort)
3	Average passing rates on <u>all</u> certification examinations	Peer institutions	Percent of student passing <u>all</u> certification examinations given at the University	Fall 2000
<b>UMUC</b>				
1	Number of African-Americans of all IT graduates	MAITI report for UMUC; IPEDS completion data for peer institutions	Number of graduates of IT (MAITI) undergraduate programs who are African-American. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), and electrical engineering (CIP 14.10).	FY 2001
2	% of undergraduate students who are 25 and older	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Percent of undergraduate students who are older than 25 years of age	Fall 2000
3	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields	IPEDS, Completions survey	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), electrical engineering (CIP 14.10), management information systems (CIP 52.1201), system networking/telecommunication (CIP 52.1204).	FY 2001
4	Number of worldwide online courses	Peer institutions	Number of courses offered online	FY 2002
5	Number of worldwide online enrollments	Peer institutions	Number of enrollments in online courses	FY 2002



## Appendix C: Morgan State University Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1 Second year retention rate	Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) – Enrollment Information System (EIS), Degree Information System (DIS).	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2000 cohort
2 Second year retention rate of African Americans	US News and World Report, America's Best Colleges. MHEC – EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2000 cohort
3 Second year retention rate of minorities	MHEC – EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	<i>In this context, the term "minorities" refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.</i>	Fall 2000 cohort
4 Six year graduation rate	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation. The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates that graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1994 Cohort
5 Six year graduation rate of African Americans	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1994 Cohort
6 Six year graduation rate of minorities	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	<i>In this context, the term "minorities" refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.</i> The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and	Fall 1994 Cohort

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
7	Percent increase in doctoral degrees awarded over base year FY 1999	Hispanic undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation. Self-explanatory	
8	Graduate/Professional school going rate	IPEDS, Postsecondary Completions. MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions. The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 2000 bachelor's degree recipients
9	Student satisfaction with advanced studies preparation	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation and who rated their preparation for advanced education as excellent, good, or adequate (fair) preparation for their job. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 2000 bachelor's degree recipients
10	Student satisfaction with job preparation.	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions. The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients employed full-time within one year of graduation and who rated their education as excellent, good, or adequate (fair) preparation for their job. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 2000 bachelor's degree recipients
11	PRAXIS II pass rate	HEA Title II: Aggregate and Summary Institution- Level Pass Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the State for licensure and the total pass rate.	2000-2001 academic year

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
	Program. Peer Institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	<i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	
12 Employer satisfaction	MSU Survey Employers.  Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Average of nine dimensions of employers' rating of satisfaction with Morgan alumni.  <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 2000 bachelor's degree recipients
13 Alumni giving	MSU Development Office.  Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Percent of Morgan's graduates who made contributions to the University during a fiscal year. The base for deriving the percentage is the total number of Morgan graduates for whom <i>good</i> contact information is available	Most current data available
		<i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	
14 Percent growth in grants and contracts (research) expenditures over base of FY 1990	MSU Budget Office.  IPEDS Peer institutions.	Self-explanatory	



## Appendix D: St. Mary's College of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1	Amount of total R&D spending, FY 2000	IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds expenditures on research	FY 2002
2	Percent of Faculty with Terminal Degrees	US News and World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Percentage of full-time faculty who hold a terminal degree	2002
3	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	Academe, March-April 2001 edition	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	Spring 2001
4	Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank	Academe, March-April 2001 edition	Interpolated percentile of average full-time faculty salary as compared to national salaries	Spring 2001
5	Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Midpoint of 25 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles	Fall 2000
6	25 <sup>th</sup> – 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	25 <sup>th</sup> – 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile SAT total scores of entering freshmen	Fall 2000
7	Acceptance rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Percentage of fall 2000 applicants who were admitted	Fall 2000
8	Yield ratio	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Percentage of fall 2000 admitted applicants who ultimately enrolled	Fall 2000
9	Second year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who re-enrolled the subsequent year	Fall 1999 – Fall 2000

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
10	Average six-year graduation rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Average six-year graduation rate for all students	1997-2000 (1991, 1992, 1993, 1994 freshman cohorts)
11	Six-year graduation rate for African Americans	Peer institutions	Six-year graduation rate for African-Americans	2001 (1995 cohort)
12	Total headcount enrollment	2000 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Total of all students (including graduate students) enrolled at an institution	Fall 2000
13	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	2000 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Percentage of minorities of the total enrollment with race known, non resident aliens are excluded	Fall 2000
14	Percent of full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	2000 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Percentage of undergraduate students who are enrolled full-time	Fall 2000
15	Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	2000 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Percentage of an institution's total enrollment that is undergraduate	Fall 2000
16	Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	2000 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Part D	Annual tuition and fees for full-time in-state undergraduate student	Fall 2000
17	Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal government	2000 IPEDS Student Financial Aid	Percentage of full-time freshmen receiving federal grant aid	FY 2000
18	E&G expenditures per FTES	2000 IPEDS Finance Report, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey, Part E	FY 2000 total education and general expenditures and transfers divided by fall 1998 full-time equivalent students (undergraduate credit hour activity divided by 15)	FY 2000, Fall 1998
19	Average alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Percentage of solicited alumni who gave to an institution	1999-2000

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
20	Tuition and fees revenue as percent of E&G expenditures	2000 IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds revenues from tuition and fees as a percent of FY 2000 total education and general expenditures and transfers	FY 2000
21	Ratio of FTES to full-time faculty	1999 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey, Part E, U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2002 edition	Fall 1998 FTE students (undergraduate credit hour activity divided by 15) divided by the number of fall 2000 full-time faculty	Fall 1998 Fall 2000
22	Academic library holdings	Peterson's Website	Number of titles, serial subscriptions, and audiovisual materials	
23	Academic library expenditures per FTES	1996 IPEDS Finance Report, 1999 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey, Part E	FY 1996 academic library expenditures divided by fall 1998 full-time equivalent students	FY 1996 Fall 1998

